

The Morse formula amendments and enactments between 1946 and 1952, inclusive

Congress No.	Session	Bill No.	Public Law No.	Amount of property involved	Proposed use of property	Consideration proposed	Consideration given as result of formula	Citation
82	2	S. 2959	(1)	Approximately 30 acres	Training the National Guard	0	50 percent of the appraised fair market value.	98 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 6, p. 7817.
82	2	H.R. 2190	544	Approximately 11 acres	Road	0	Senate receded from its own amendment in conference (H. Rept. 2496).	98 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 7, pp. 9063, 9089.
82	2	H.R. 3368	(1)	Approximately 17.76 acres	Hatching fish	0	50 percent of the appraised fair market value.	98 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 1, p. 488.
82	2	H.R. 7317	525	Approximately 263 acres	Drilling of water wells and general town expansion.	\$1,950	Appraised fair market value.	98 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 7, p. 9328.
82	1	H.R. 4808	229	Approximately 150 acres	Easement for a public road	(2)	Amendment rejected by Senate on floor.	97 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 10, pp. 13541-13542.
81	2	H.R. 2783	520	Approximately 0.143 acre	City use	0	50 percent of the appraised fair market value.	96 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 4, p. 5348.
81	2	H.R. 4569	868	Approximately 640 acres	National Guard and veterans temporary housing.	0	Amendment rejected in conference (H. Rept. 3098).	96 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 11, pp. 14709-14710.
81	1	H.R. 164	54	Approximately 10.11 acres	School purposes	(3)	50 percent of the appraised fair market value.	95 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 4, p. 4254.
81	1	H.R. 3751	4208	Steel fire tower	Observation tower for the International Peace Garden.	0	Amendment rejected in conference (H. Rept. 1193).	95 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 6, p. 8013.
81	1	H.R. 6230	412	Approximately 0.18 of an acre	Street construction	0	50 percent of the fair market value.	95 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 11, p. 14768.
80	2	S. 2676	822	Approximately 5.17 acres	University expansion	0	50 percent of the appraised fair market value.	94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 8, p. 793.
80	2	H.R. 5734	831	Approximately 430.91 acres	Public park and golf course	0	Senate receded from its own amendment on the floor.	94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 7, pp. 8718-8719, 9011.
80	2	H.R. 6448	803	Approximately 32 acres	Fairgrounds and recreational use.	0	50 percent of the appraised fair market value.	94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 7, p. 8242.

¹ Amended and passed Senate.
² Land exchange.

³ To be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior.
⁴ Private law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think my record on the Morse formula, as shown by the foregoing, needs no further clarification or elaboration at this time. I am very proud to stand on this record of a one-man economy drive in the U.S. Senate, a record which I believe has resulted in a saving of at least \$900 million in 14 years. But, more important, I am proud to stand on the record of the formula, because, in my judgment, it also has involved a matter of political ethics, for I have felt that turning surplus property into a political grab bag cannot be very well reconciled with good political ethics. So I have proposed the formula and have fought for it because I felt it would also make a contribution to cleaner government. I am perfectly willing to be judged on whether that has been accomplished by my insistence upon the formula.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Cuba WHY NOT USE FOREIGN AID TO STOP TRADE WITH CUBA?

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, in a few days the Senate will consider the foreign aid appropriation bill. One of the very controversial aspects of the bill involves the efforts by the House to provide limitations on foreign aid to countries whose ships are used to transport goods and materials—particularly war materials—to Cuba.

I believe this question deserves very thoughtful and careful inquiry before the Senate rejects those amendments.

Some newspaper articles indicate that it is assumed that the Senate will act quickly to reject those amendments or to replace them with language to make such action discretionary, with the result that our Government will take no action to discourage this trade.

Mr. President, yesterday, on the "Meet the Press" program, the Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain, Reginald Maudling was asked by Mr. Spivak why Britain continues to trade with Cuba.

Mr. Maudling's answer was the very logical one that he recognized the harmful effects on freedom and the benefits to communism that the Cuban situation now represents; but he said that they feel that trade with Cuba should depend on the initiative of the United States of America. He said they feel they have the responsibility in some areas of Africa and Asia, and that they hope the United States would respond to their initiative, but they do not have any knowledge or understanding that the United States wishes them to desist and cease in their trade with Cuba.

Mr. President, ever since February 3 of this year, we have had an embargo on all trade with Cuba. It has been at considerable expense to American business; but I think it has been a wise, necessary, and desirable embargo. The economic effect on the Communist satellite in Cuba has been clear; but, unfortunately, the economic effect has not been nearly as strong as it would be if we obtained cooperation from our Allies. Judging from Mr. Maudling's statement of yesterday to the panel on the "Meet the Press" program, it seems that this is because the British Government has not been informed, or, at least, requested to reduce or eliminate their trade with Cuba.

Mr. President, this is not simply a matter of allied ships transporting arms to Cuba. Obviously, we are opposed to that, but the fact is that any trade with Cuba assists the Communists and constitutes a growing threat to freedom in this hemisphere.

On September 16, it was pointed out in an article published in the New York Times that—

The use of allied ships for ordinary goods—

To Cuba—

releases Communist-bloc shipping for munitions deliveries to Cuba.

This is true; and, of course, it is also obvious that any kind of goods which go to Cuba—whether war goods or other

goods—are beneficial to a buildup of the Communist economy and of the Communist strength in this hemisphere.

The article also points out that fully one-third of the Soviet deliveries to Cuba are said to be in ships chartered to allied countries.

At a recent press conference, President Kennedy is quoted as saying that—

Our friends in NATO must realize the implications of their engaging in the Cuban trade.

Nevertheless, according to the article, Cuba has been getting machinery and industrial raw materials from Canada, diesel motors and chemicals from West Germany, and machinery and chemicals from Britain. The Netherlands and France have also exported goods to Cuba.

The title of the article is "United States Fails To Halt Supplies to Cuba in Allied Vessels."

SHOULD WE AID NATIONS WHOSE NATIONALS TRADE WITH CUBA?

Mr. President, I feel that it is perfectly appropriate for Congress to consider tying strings to our foreign-aid program and relating the foreign aid that we give to our allies to their willingness to cooperate with us in the struggle against communism, especially against communism in this hemisphere. This is a far cry from asking for a military embargo on Cuba. It is a far cry from calling for an invasion of Cuba. It seems to me it is a modest and defensible proposal, and I believe we might seriously consider including in the foreign-aid bill a proviso to the effect that foreign aid should not be given to such countries—not only to those which give aid to Cuba, but also to those whose nationals trade with Cuba. I think we should give every consideration to such a proposal.

The statistics which I have before me show that trade with Cuba by some of our allies has continued in 1962, as compared with 1961. Unfortunately, the State Department and the Department of Commerce cannot provide the com-

plete figures. However, it is interesting to note that during the entire year 1961 the United Kingdom exported \$13 million worth of goods to Cuba; and in the first 4 months of 1962 the United Kingdom exported to Cuba \$3,170,000 worth of goods, or at an annual rate of approximately \$9 million—a reduction, it is true, but not really a very substantial reduction, in view of the fact that since February 3, 1962, we have had an embargo on trade with Cuba. Furthermore, the United Kingdom has increased her imports from Cuba, when considered on an annual adjusted basis. For the full year 1961, she imported \$15 million worth of goods from Cuba; and in the first 4 months of 1962 the United Kingdom imported \$5,560,000 worth of goods from Cuba. On an adjusted annual basis, that means that the United Kingdom was importing in early 1962 more than \$16,500,000 worth of goods from Cuba—or an increase in her imports from Cuba.

West Germany in 1961 imported \$1,900,000 worth of goods and products from Cuba. But in the first 4 months of 1962 alone she imported more than that—\$2,150,000. This represents a threefold increase. West Germany imported three times as much in the first 4 months of 1962, at an annual rate, as she imported in 1961.

It is true that West Germany has sharply reduced her exports to Cuba, but she still exported in the first 4 months of this year \$1,650,000 worth, which, on an annual basis, would amount to \$5 million, compared with \$11 million exported to Cuba for the full year 1961.

Unfortunately, with respect to the country which traded most heavily in 1961 with Cuba—Canada—the Commerce Department and the State Department have made no figures available. These figures would be very interesting, indeed, if they were completed.

On the basis of information acquired during a telephone conversation of September 21, 1962, with the Department of Commerce, American Republics Division, I am informed that the Canadians are willing to deal with Cuba, but they have arrested the transshipment of American goods. Canadian disposition to trade has been quenched by Cuban bankruptcy. For example, Canada has closed the commercial section of its Embassy in Cuba.

Mr. President, so far as trade with Japan is concerned, the Commerce Department has informed me that the United States has acquired and relayed to the Japanese a Cuban document showing that sugar production in the immediate future will be insufficient to meet Cuba's commitments to the Communist bloc. This, coupled with U.S. efforts to divert Japan's sugar purchases, indicates that Japanese-Cuban trade will be sharply off the volume reached in 1961.

Although Cuba has sent a sugar mission to Japan, the Japanese are securing an increasing part of their sugar from India, Thailand, Natal, the Philippines, and Formosa.

Cuba is attempting to buy back its sugar—futures—from the bloc in order to meet its offer to sell Japan 400,000 tons during 1962.

It is expected that Japan will buy less than 200,000 tons of sugar from Cuba this year.

Japan's central bank export-import statistics deviate from the Commerce Department information we have; they show Japan exporting \$12 million to Cuba in 1961, while importing \$21 million, over 90 percent of this in sugar.

My source is the Japanese Embassy: Washington; New York.

Incidentally, in 1961 Mexico had substantial trade with Cuba, but this was because of transshipment of American goods and parts to Cuba.

In calendar 1961 Mexico exported \$3,500,000 worth of goods to Cuba, including iron, steel, and pump replacement parts.

There were other substantial shipments from South American countries—for example, \$3,400,000 worth from Chile, and there was additional trade.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the proclamation by the President of the United States on February 3, 1962, declaring an embargo on trade with Cuba, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROCLAMATION—EMBARGO ON ALL TRADE WITH CUBA BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the eighth meeting of consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, serving as organ of consultation in application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, in its final act resolved that the present Government of Cuba is incompatible with the principles and objectives of the inter-American system; and, in light of the subversive offensive of Sino-Soviet communism with which the Government of Cuba is publicly allied, urged the member states to take those steps that they may consider appropriate for their individual and collective self-defense;

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 445), as amended, has authorized the President to establish and maintain an embargo upon all trade between the United States and Cuba; and

Whereas the United States, in accordance with its international obligations, is prepared to take all necessary actions to promote national and hemispheric security by isolating the present Government of Cuba and thereby reducing the threat posed by its alignment with Communist powers;

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority of section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 445), as amended, do—

1. Hereby proclaim an embargo upon trade between the United States and Cuba in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 3 of this proclamation.

2. Hereby prohibit, effective 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time, February 7, 1962, the importation into the United States of all goods of Cuban origin and all goods imported from or through Cuba; and hereby authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out such prohibition, to make such exceptions thereto, by license or otherwise, as he determines to be consistent with the effective operation of the embargo hereby proclaimed; and to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to perform such functions;

3. And further, I do hereby direct the Secretary of Commerce, under the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2021-2032), to continue to carry out the prohibition of all exports from the United States to Cuba, and I hereby authorize him, under that act, to continue, make, modify or revoke exceptions from such prohibition.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 3d day of February 1962, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 186th.

[SEAL]

By the President:

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of an article entitled "United States Fails To Halt Supplies to Cuba in Allied Vessels," from the Sunday New York Times of September 16, 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES FAILS TO HALT SUPPLIES TO CUBA IN ALLIED VESSELS—EFFORTS TO CURB CHARTERING OF SHIPS CARRYING CARGOES FROM REES ARE LAGGING

WASHINGTON, September 15.—The United States has had little success thus far in efforts to persuade its allies to do less business with Cuba and withhold ships being chartered to carry Soviet supplies to Cuba.

Moreover, U.S. officials do not expect much success and they are not especially worried at present. A high-ranking Government official expressed the administration feeling that the Cuba problem is less threatening this year than it was last year.

He called attention to the increasingly critical economic situation reported in Cuba. He also mentioned reports of an increasing loss of popular support by the government of Premier Fidel Castro.

The Governments of Britain, West Germany, and Norway were reported to have begun inquiries into the chartering of ships in their countries to deliver Communist-bloc supplies to Cuba.

INQUIRIES DISCOUNTED

However, the inquiries were regarded here as polite responses to diplomatic pressure from the United States. There was little expectation that they would result in any serious prohibitions.

The inquiries were believed to be centered chiefly on the question whether allied ships are engaged in delivering arms to Cuba during the current military buildup there. United States sources have said that they do not believe the arms are being transported in allied ships. However, it was noted that the use of allied ships for ordinary goods releases Communist-bloc shipping for munitions deliveries to Cuba.

According to one highly placed Government official, the fact that the Soviet Union and other Communist-bloc countries have been compelled to resort to the use of allied shipping represents a severe economic loss to the Communists. Fully one-third of Soviet deliveries to Cuba was said to be in ships chartered in allied countries.

President Kennedy declared at his news conference this week that the United States was disturbed by allied commerce with Cuba. "Our friends in NATO must realize the implications of their engaging in the Cuban trade," he said.

United States officials indicated that they would like to see further reductions in allied

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19351

trade with Cuba, although it has dropped in recent years.

When the Castro regime took power in January of 1959, 80 percent of its trade was with the United States. Today 80 percent of its trade is with Communist-bloc countries.

Nevertheless, Cuba has been getting machinery and industrial raw materials from Canada, diesel motors and chemicals from West Germany, and machinery and chemicals from Britain. The Netherlands and France also have exported goods to Cuba.

According to figures available here, North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries sold Cuba about \$138 million worth of goods in 1959 and purchased goods amounting to \$79 million. In 1961, NATO exports dropped to \$86 million and imports from Cuba to \$32 million.

In addition, Japan conducted a \$16 million annual trade with Cuba, exchanging light machinery for sugar. Chile was the only country in Latin America reported to have an appreciable trade with Cuba bartering various foodstuffs for sugar.

TWO ALLIES INCREASE TRADE

Two allied countries increased their trade with Cuba during the 2-year period, 1959-61, contrary to the general trend. Canada was the biggest allied trader with Cuba in 1961, exporting \$31,800,000 worth of goods, slightly more than double her 1959 exports. The Netherlands increased her trade total with Cuba from \$8,276,000 to \$10,920,000.

The United States, which ended all imports from Cuba and limited sales to food and medical supplies, is now sending less than \$50,000 worth of such supplies to Cuba each month.

SOVIET SAYS UNITED STATES FAILED

Moscow, September 15.—The Soviet Union asserted today that the United States had failed to persuade its allies to bar their ships from carrying Communist goods to Cuba.

Moscow maintained that the United States had sought, within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to compel NATO members to withdraw their merchant ships from chartered service in trade between the Soviet Union and Cuba.

Viktor G. Bakayev, Minister of Sea Transport, said that shipowners in many countries were eagerly seeking the lucrative contracts for carrying goods on a charter basis. He added:

"Lately the Government of the United States has been using NATO to bring crude pressure to bear on Britain, Norway, France, Italy, Greece, and other countries to force them to stop carrying goods to Cuba."

"But Washington has been unable to impose its will on its 'allies,'" the Minister said in an interview published by Tass, the Soviet press agency.

President Kennedy said at his news conference on August 28 that the United States was consulting its NATO allies on the question of the use of their ships in the Cuba trade. His remarks followed after the publication of a Tass report that five ships of West German, Norwegian, Greek, and Italian registry had been chartered to carry Soviet commercial cargoes to Cuba.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON
BEFORE NATIONAL BANK DIVISION,
AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION

During Mr. PROXMIRE's speech on trade with Cuba,

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to

the Senator from Alabama with the understanding that I will not lose the floor and that his remarks will appear elsewhere in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished and very able chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] made a speech before the National Bank Division of the American Bankers Association at Atlantic City, N.J. As everyone knows, the Senator from Virginia has been a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee ever since he came to the Senate. He was put on the committee in January 1947. About 3 years or so ago, he became chairman of the committee. He is a very able and fair chairman. He is forthright in his views.

In his speech to the National Bank Division of the American Bankers Association he set forth many points in which the bankers and the banking industry are interested. I commend the address to the reading of fellow Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it may appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETWEEN TWO WORLDS

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, Before the National Bank Division of the American Bankers Association, Atlantic City, N.J., Sept. 24, 1962)

It is a coveted honor to appear before this distinguished group of financial leaders here in Atlantic City. It is also a personal pleasure to be on the same program with a Comptroller of the Currency who is unusually able and energetic, and who is dedicated to improving the somewhat antiquated laws under which our national banks operate.

If I am expected to tell you today what the present administration is planning to do for—or to—the Nation's financial institutions, I would have to beg off for lack of a proper New Frontier crystal ball. Perhaps the officials of the administration who will appear later on this program can be more helpful. But future actions by the executive branch will depend in part upon the course of yet unrevealed future events as well as the decisions of the legislative branch. So, too, future actions by the legislative branch will be subject to similar degrees of uncertainty.

I would like to take this opportunity to say that I think highly of the job that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Douglas Dillon, has been doing. His staff—including Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, who is an outstanding expert in his field—merits our respect. If such men had full charge of the administration's economic policies, I feel that we could rest better assured that our dollars would remain as good as gold and our economy as sound as our dollars.

Unlike these dedicated public servants, there are some extreme economic planners in Washington who would like to influence the administration to follow the mood of the Persian poet, Omar Khayyam, who wrote:

"Ah love, could you and I with Him conspire
To grasp this Sorry Scheme of Things entire,

Would not we shatter it to bits—and then
Remould it nearer to the Heart's desire."

I, for one, would prefer to take the counsel given by President Woodrow Wilson in his first inaugural address, when he said:

"We shall deal with our economic system as it is and as it may be modified, not as it might be if we had a clean sheet of paper to write upon."

You will recall that some of the administration's financial experts predicted that our national economy would be operating this year at an average rate of some \$570 billion, with the slogan of "upward and onward" flying from the masthead of every business establishment. It is true that we are now turning out goods and services at an unprecedented rate. Our national income has reached an all-time high. Yet our gross national product—which registered a record seasonally adjusted annual rate of \$552 billion in the second quarter of this year—was well below the \$570 billion anticipated.

As a result, some of our more extreme economic planners are dissatisfied. They claim that we are on an economic plateau, although many indicators point upward. These economic planners cannot point with pride even to a plateau which, if it exists, would be the highest one in history.

The varied prescriptions of these planners may leave many bankers and other businessmen in a quandary about what may happen next. Most Americans may, indeed, find themselves in the fix of the English poet, Matthew Arnold, who wrote of wandering between two worlds, one dead, and the other as yet unborn.

As a Virginian, I cherish the thought that my colonial ancestors helped to cradle and defend the infancy of a nation dedicated to the principles of private enterprise and constitutional liberty. I would be the last to repudiate the philosophy of Patrick Henry, who said that "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience."

Many other nations have experimented first with one government and then another. Meanwhile, we have maintained our allegiance to what Benjamin Franklin said the framers of the Constitution in Philadelphia in 1787 had given us—"a Republic if you can preserve it."

We have enjoyed the same form of government for a longer period than almost any other nation. Under our Government we have been the freest, happiest, and most prosperous country in the world. It has been no coincidence, I believe, that we have made our remarkable record while operating under a written Constitution which created a Federal Government of strictly limited and delegated powers, and which left all other powers to the States and the people thereof.

Those of us who believe with Patrick Henry that experience is the only lamp unto our feet agree with Thomas Jefferson, another great Virginian, who said:

"In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

We who share that philosophy frankly admit that in return for a system of private enterprise implicit in the Constitution is the willingness to accept a poor reward for an inadequate performance.

But some of our more extreme economic planners feel otherwise. Although more workers are now gainfully employed than ever before, these planners are disturbed by the fact that some unemployment persists. Yet they fail to recognize that our method of keeping unemployment statistics tends to overstate the problem by including persons looking only for parttime employment, persons transferring from one job to another, and persons content to be on relief and only casually looking for work.

The measures that these planners have in mind for the future remain uncertain, but

19352

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 24

they may well involve some further departure from constitutional principles and some further step toward socialism. In that event, I shall oppose them in the spirit of Robert Louis Stevenson, who said: "To travel hopelessly is a better thing than to arrive."

Whatever the case, let us look forward to next year as a time of significant banking anniversaries and of significant action in behalf of modernizing banking laws: 1963 will mark the 100th anniversary of the permanent dual system of American banking. I applaud the American Bankers Association for its leadership in establishing a centennial commission to celebrate this event. I understand that the centennial, with the theme of a century of banking "Progress Through Service" under the National Bank Act, will include both State and National banks in the celebration.

I believe that it is particularly appropriate to recognize State as well as federally chartered institutions in this way. The intent of the National Bank Act of 1863, of course, was to bring all bank charters under Federal authority so that State banks would be superseded by National banks. But experience did not justify that plan. Today, State banks outnumber National banks by about two to one, and many State banks predate National banks.

The year 1963 will represent the 50th anniversary of the Federal Reserve Act, and the 50th anniversary of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. The Federal Reserve Act was signed December 23, 1913, by a great President, Woodrow Wilson, whom we in Virginia are proud to claim as a native son. Earlier in the same year, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency was itself established for the purpose of considering the proposed Federal Reserve Act. This act had been sponsored in the House of Representatives by another great Virginian, Carter Glass, who was my predecessor in the Senate. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee is now studying a number of suggestions for marking its 50th anniversary in an appropriate way.

Next year will witness the 30th anniversary of the Banking Act of 1933, in which Carter Glass also played a notable part. This act, among other things, established the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. It is fitting that the new headquarters office building of the FDIC is scheduled for occupancy in time to mark its 30th anniversary.

The year 1963, in other words, will be an occasion for commemorating a number of events which have helped to shape the banking world we know today. Next year will also be an occasion for reexamining today's banking world in the light of important reports recently completed or soon to be finished.

The last time the American Bankers Association met here in Atlantic City, I had the privilege of addressing the State bank division. I referred to my Financial Institutions Act, which had passed the Senate in March of 1957 and was then pending on the House side. The bill passed the Senate unanimously. If it had been brought to a vote in the House, I believe that it would have been passed easily by that body. But the bill was strangled in committee. Even so, many of the banking reports and most of the significant banking laws since that time have been the outgrowth of the studies and recommendations embodied in my Financial Institutions Act of 1957.

In February of this year, our distinguished Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. Saxon, appointed a splendid advisory committee to help him make a comprehensive study of the functioning of the national banking system. This study was completed only recently. I am sure that any recommendations for amendments to the National Bank Act and

related statutes that may be submitted by Mr. Saxon will receive careful attention by the Congress.

In March of this year, President Kennedy appointed a Special Intragovernmental Committee on Financial Institutions. This Committee was charged with studying the proposals of the Commission on Money and Credit as a starting point for a complete review of legislation and administrative practices relating to the operations of our financial intermediaries. The Committee was directed to report to the President by November 30, 1962, what changes, if any, in Government policy toward private financial institutions could contribute to economic stability, growth, and efficiency.

Besides these reports, the Securities and Exchange Commission has underway a study and investigation of the adequacy of the rules of the national securities exchanges and national securities associations. The final SEC report to the Congress on its study of the stock market, together with recommendations for legislation, must be submitted to the Congress by April 3, 1963. The SEC report may well contain a number of recommendations affecting banks. There may be some consideration, for example, of over-the-counter trading in bank and other stocks, including the question of financial reports. There may also be some consideration of whether regulation U—dealing with requirements on loans by banks for the purpose of buying or carrying listed stocks—might be extended to cover other designated financial institutions, or to cover unlisted securities.

I should like to take this opportunity to pledge my cooperation during the 88th Congress to appropriate legislative recommendations forthcoming from each of these studies and reports.

I hope that all proposals to create a better financial world will be proposals within the framework of our Constitution and calculated to improve the working of a system of free competitive enterprise. Preservation of the soundness of the dollar should be the keynote of our banking and fiscal program.

The record of the Federal Government in that behalf in recent years has not been good. We closed the last fiscal year with a deficit of more than \$6 billion. We are now confronted with a substantial deficit for the current fiscal year. Its ultimate size will be determined first by whether or not the President spends all of the emergency funds made available to him, and second, by whether or not the Congress passes a bill to cut taxes. If the President uses all of his spending power and if we have a tax cut of as much as \$10 billion, we could possibly run up the largest peacetime deficit in our Nation's history. In that event, great pressure might be brought to bear on the Federal Reserve Board to hold down interest rates by creating easy money to hide from the public the inflationary results of deficit financing. However, it is my belief as well as hope that the Federal Reserve Board will not yield to that type of political pressure.

By next year, as I have said, our dual system of National and State banks will embody the results of 100 years of uninterrupted experience under the National Bank Act of 1863, and 40 years of earlier experience under the First and Second Banks of the United States. This dual system will also represent the outcome of 50 years of experience under the Federal Reserve Act of 1913.

That tested dual system, with its freedom of choice for the public and for bankers, should remain free of Government regulation to the greatest degree consistent with sound banking and the protection of depositors. We must work not only to preserve that dual system of banking, but to improve it.

It is also essential to maintain the freedom of the Federal Reserve in its conduct of

monetary policy from undue control by other governmental agencies or by the Congress.

Being a creature of the Congress, the Federal Reserve should continue to operate ultimately under congressional direction. Yet the System was deliberately established to be less subject to political influence than the usual independent Federal body. In fact, the report of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted by Carter Glass in 1913 on the proposed Federal Reserve Act, emphasized that "it cannot be too emphatically stated that the committee regards the Federal Reserve Board as a distinctly nonpartisan organization whose functions are to be wholly divorced from politics."

The independence of the Board stems from a number of legislative provisions. It reports annually to the Congress rather than to the executive branch of the Government. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency—both representatives of the executive branch—no longer are ex officio members of the Federal Reserve Board as the act originally provided. The seven members of the Board of Governors are now all appointed for 14-year terms by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and can be removed from office only by impeachment.

I believe that bank supervision, examination, chartering, and regulation should be undertaken by banking experts rather than by nonbanking agencies or departments. Bankers as well as the public have a right to expect a uniform banking policy to be followed on mergers, branches, holding companies, and other important supervisory matters. They also have a right to a speedy decision on matters submitted to the discretion of the banking agencies and in all anti-trust proceedings.

As the Financial Institutions Act of 1957 proposed, many Federal banking statutes should be modernized if banks are to meet today's industrial and commercial needs. Similarly, a great deal needs to be done to simplify some of the voluminous banking regulations and to bring them up to date.

Under present conditions, the banking system continues to evidence its ability to fulfill changing credit needs and new credit requirements. Our exports are being stimulated by widening bank lending under the new export credit insurance and guarantee program of the Foreign Credit Insurance Association. This program has been developed under legislation (Public Law 87-311, S. 2825) reported to the Senate last year by the Banking and Currency Committee. Our small businesses are being benefited by the new joint program recently announced by the Small Business Administration and the American Bankers Association to provide term loans for small businesses through the cooperation of both Government and banks.

The recent upsurge in savings deposits in banks has given rise to renewed interest in real estate and other higher yielding investments. According to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, real estate lending by national banks increased significantly during the first half of 1962, as time deposits of national banks rose 13 percent while demand deposits declined 8 percent.

Only recently, a bill, which I supported, was considered by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee (H.R. 7798) to provide national banks with greater encouragement to meet real estate credit needs for real estate and construction loans.

Banks as well as the public have benefited greatly from the adoption of Federal deposit insurance. By the end of last year, deposits in insurance banks totaled \$281 billion. Of this total, an estimated \$164 billion was insured under the limit of \$10,000 for each depositor.

To preserve the integrity of this insurance program as well as to maintain public con-

19326

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 24

The net cost after allowing for net Commodity Credit Corporation stock reductions of 425 million bushels, for which there would be compensation, would be reduced to about \$595 million. That is why I say the program is working well. The cost is moderate in terms of costs in the past. The program is reducing the surpluses.

Under the 1963 provisions with participation in the program and acreage diversion payments as estimated above, acreage diversion payments would be \$550 million, price support payments would be \$573 million, resulting in total payments of \$1,123 million, or \$103 million higher than the total estimated cost of the 1962 program.

But that would be only the beginning. With 9 million additional acres planted to corn and grain sorghums an additional 400 to 500 million bushels of feed grains might be produced compared to the result if the 1962 provision had been continued.

If yields in 1963 are as high as in 1961-62, there would be no net reduction in CCC stocks of feed grains, and the net cost of the program would approximate \$1,123 million, or almost double the net cost of the 1962 program, more than half a billion dollars higher.

The farmers would be no better off, and the taxpayer's would be \$600 million worse off. The pressure would be on us next year, when the Congress considered the bill, both in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and in the Senate, to proceed with a mandatory program, which the farmers do not want and which probably they would vote down. The pressure would be on us to adopt that kind of program, and it would be a very heavy pressure indeed.

Mr. President, the difficulty is that the farmer under the conference proposal would get almost as much payment for diverting 20 percent of his land under the new proposal as he was paid for diverting 40 percent under the old proposal. With this kind of payment, we would not get the reduction in acreage needed to reduce production.

Now the payment this year under present law is \$1.20 a bushel for cooperators, for those who divert acres, plus 50 percent of \$1.20 on normal production of the first 20 percent of diverted acres, or 60 cents. Then, in addition, it is 60 percent of \$1.20 on normal production of the next 20 percent of diverted acres, or 72 cents. Therefore, the farmer now has an incentive to divert not 20 percent but 40 percent of the acres, because he gets 72 cents per bushel for production on the second 20 percent of acres diverted.

Furthermore, the small farmer could divert his entire production. Many of them have done so. The statistics which I have put into the Record show a result with respect to corn of more than 45 percent of the base acreage diverted. That is a tremendous diversion. The program has been a great success.

INCENTIVE FOR DIVERSION GONE IN CONFERENCE

Under the new program these incentives vanish. The compiler who diverted only 20 percent of the acreage still would get an effective \$1.20 a bushel—including

an 18-cent cash payment—while the noncomplier would get \$1.02 a bushel. There would be a difference, though. There would be no extra payment over the 50 percent for diverting more than 20 percent of the acreage.

In addition, the base upon which the 50 percent would be figured would be \$1.02, and not \$1.20, so the payment would be 51 cents, half of \$1.02, and not 72 cents.

Furthermore, after the reduction of 20 percent, the cooperators would get 18 cents a bushel on all production; hence, there would be only a 33 cent incentive for not producing, compared to a 72 cent incentive under the old program. That is why I think my estimate that there would be a 25-percent diversion instead of a 45-percent diversion is realistic.

Under the new plan the total payments would be almost as good—benefits over 90 percent as high—for diverting 20 percent of the acreage, as under the old plan for a 40-percent diversion of acreage.

Mr. President, I must say that this is an exceedingly difficult vote for me to cast, because I think that one can make some argument that the conference report possibly would provide a better income for feed grain farmers, for one year, but the situation in 1963 would be almost impossible for those of us who want to represent the dairy farmers honestly and well in the U.S. Senate. We would be placed in the position that if we did not act the farmers would get 50-percent price supports for feed grains with no controls voluntary or mandatory. This would result in a terrific overproduction of milk and a terrific overproduction of hogs at very low prices, perhaps 9 or 10 cents—but if we do act the administration would be in a position, with a veto power, to require that we take the mandatory controls the administration wants.

CHRONOLOGY OF U.S. RELATIONS WITH CUBA FROM 1957 TO 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, early this year, I asked the Department of State to prepare for me a chronology of U.S. relations with Cuba from the time we suspended arms shipments to its Fascist government to the time when the Communist government of Cuba openly embraced the Sino-Soviet bloc and became an ally of it.

I had asked the Department of State to prepare this chronology because I have often been disturbed by the misguided opinion frequently heard in this country that Fidel Castro turned to communism because, in effect, the United States was not nice enough to him.

For myself, I think it would be hard to find any new government which has come to power in the Western Hemisphere in this century with more interest, support, and sympathy from the United States than which the Castro government enjoyed. In my opinion, there was at the time an enthusiasm for Castro in the United States that was itself totally blind to the excesses the revolution committed against its own people. I well recall the abuse I received myself from segments of the press when I called

for an end to the bloodbath of mass executions that marked the early months of that new government.

How anyone could find more to admire in summary execution and murder perpetrated by Castro and his cohorts than the same crimes committed by Batista and his cohorts is beyond my understanding.

Nonetheless, we offered the hand of friendship to Castro from the beginning, including the offer of financial assistance. Moreover, our purchases of Cuban sugar were continued for some time after "Che" Guevara declared that American purchases of Cuban sugar have meant slavery for the people of Cuba.

I am pleased to place this chronology of events in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as testimony of the good faith effort the United States put forth for many months to maintain friendly relations with Castro even in the face of many provocations. I ask unanimous consent to have this chronology, with its covering letter and memorandum, printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the chronology, letter, and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1962.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I refer to your letter of February 20, 1962, and to my interim reply of March 6, 1962, concerning a chronology of the important events in our relations with Cuba since 1957.

Enclosed is a "Chronology of Important Events in United States-Cuban Relations, 1957-1962," which responds to the points raised in your letter.

With regard to your inquiry as to the present whereabouts of two Cuban citizens, Mr. Manuel Antonio de Varona is now located at 1034 Michigan Avenue, Miami, Fla., and Mr. Ramon Prendes is at 624 SW. 14th Avenue, Apt. 11, Miami, Fla. Both are now in opposition to the present Communist regime in Cuba.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Enclosure: Chronology of United States-Cuban relations.

CHRONOLOGY OF IMPORTANT EVENTS IN UNITED STATES-CUBAN RELATIONS, 1957-62

SUMMARY

The attached chronology for the period 1957-62 records, on the one hand, U.S. Government attempts to get along with the Castro regime in Cuba, and on the other, that regime's hostility toward the United States and betrayal of the Cuban revolution to international communism.

As early as 1957 the U.S. Government expressed its concern over political unrest in Cuba. In 1958 we suspended arms shipments to the Batista government which, in disregard of an agreement with the United States, had used them to combat the revolutionary movement headed by Fidel Castro. When the Castro regime came to power in 1959, the United States looked upon it with sympathy, recognized it almost immediately, and welcomed its promises of political freedom and social justice for the Cuban people. We made clear our willingness to discuss Cuba's economic needs. Despite our concern at the Cuban regime's mounting hostility toward the United States and its growing Com-

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19325

Needless to say, I am upset by these developments. I had hoped that we could lower the cost of the voluntary program and that after 1 more year feed grain stocks would be down to desirable levels. Now, unless the weather is unfavorable next year, carryover stocks will continue to be excessive.

WIDE-RANGING STUDIES OF ALTERNATIVE FEED GRAIN PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAMS NEEDED

Mr. President, I hope a number of the Members of the Senate will join with me in urging the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake wide-ranging studies of alternative feed grain programs for the years following 1963. As our distinguished chairman knows, I am unhappy with the provisions in this conference report for feed grains after 1963. The Secretary of Agriculture is given authority to set feed grain price supports within the range of 50 to 90 percent of parity, but at such a level as will not result in a buildup in stocks. This is entirely inadequate. It is my understanding, however, that the Secretary of Agriculture will make recommendations to the next Congress for a long-term feed grains program to be effective beginning in 1964.

Next year our feet will be to the fire. Those of us who want to maintain income for dairy, beef, and hog farmers will be in a far different position than we were this year, because the alternative to doing nothing will be 50-percent price supports, which means a further cruel income drop for our farmers. It means 50 percent of parity price supports without controls, which means devastation, not only for the feed grain farmers, but for the dairy and beef farmers, too.

As a basis for these recommendations I want to urge that careful studies be undertaken of a wide range of modifications in the 1961-62 voluntary feed grain programs as well as studies of modifications in the provisions for 1963.

I have heard nothing from the staffs, or the experts, except that the administration will insist on putting into effect mandatory controls for 1964. It is going to use the provisions in the bill to get them, and we will not be able to fight for the maintenance of the present program on any basis, regardless of the merits of the voluntary program.

FEED GRAIN PROGRAM SHOULD BE FAR DIFFERENT THAN OTHER PROGRAMS

We must all recognize the very great difference between the cotton program, or the tobacco program, or the wheat program, on the one hand, and the feed grain program on the other. Eighty to eighty-five percent of the farmers who grow feed grains feed them on the farm. For that reason, controls are extremely difficult to establish and maintain.

In my view, a long-term feed grains program should have as its goal the balancing of supplies with disappearance at prevailing or moderately higher market prices and at no greater cost to the Government than the 1961-62 programs.

I think we were in sight of achieving that end. I think if the bill which passed the Senate this year had been accepted in conference, we would have had a surplus so low that balanced production and

consumption would be possible. We would not have had to worry about mandatory controls. We would not have had to worry about 50-percent price supports. But the conference report changed the situation drastically, and the result means that we are not going to get the kind of diversion we had last year and this year. As a result, next year, those who favor mandatory controls will have a great advantage.

Mr. President, somehow there seems to be a phobia on the part of some powerful people that, merely because there are mandatory programs for cotton and for tobacco, therefore everyone must be put under exactly the same kind of program, regardless of how inapplicable it may be. This is a most unfortunate situation. This attitude in the administration has caused it great difficulty this year. Those who have reflected upon it have recognized that we who oppose the mandatory controls for the feed grain farmers have been proved correct on the basis of what happened in the turkey referendum and in the wheat referendum. It is mortally certain that if a mandatory feed grain control program had passed the Congress this year the farmers would have rejected it by a majority vote, whereas it would have required a two-thirds vote to accept it. The result of this rejection would have been chaos on the farms.

I should like to document this point a little bit more before I conclude.

BASIC DATA UTILIZED IN MAKING ESTIMATES OF COSTS AND ACREAGE DIVERSION COMPARISONS UNDER PROPOSED 1963 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Total base acreage, base acreage on participating farms and intended acreage to be diverted in 1962 for corn, grain sorghums, and barley are shown in tables 13, 14, and 15 of the feed situation, USDA, May 1962, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Corn	Grain sorghum	Barley	Total
Total base acreage (million acres).....	86.3	20.9	16.0	123.2
Base acreage on participating farms (percent).....	58.5	74.0	50.0	-----
Percent of base on participating farms to be diverted.....	45.3	43.3	39.3	-----
Total acres to be diverted (million).....	22.9	6.7	3.1	32.7

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the reasons for the high percentage diversion on the participating farms is the provision that small producers may divert their entire acreage, up to a maximum of 25 acres.

The conference report provides that for 1963 feed grain producers who divert at least 20 percent of their base feed grain acres may receive an acreage diversion payment equal to 50 percent of the value of the crops produced with the loan level at \$1.02 per bushel for corn and corresponding loan levels for other feed grains. Participating producers

would also receive 18 cents a bushel for corn, about 15 cents a bushel for grain sorghum and 13 cents a bushel for barley on the normal production on the remaining base acreage. Although producers would receive diversion payments at the 50-percent rate for diverting up to 50 percent of the base acreages, there would be no economic incentive to divert more than the minimum 20 percent required to be eligible for the price support loans, price support payments and acreage diversion payments.

There are several reasons why the diversion sought will not be achieved by the conference proposal.

SMALL FARMER DIVERSION DISCOURAGED BY CONFERENCE

The small farmer, the farmer with 25 acres, will have far less incentive to reduce acreage below 50 percent, whereas it was feasible to take out of production the entire acreage under the provision passed by Congress last year.

Since the economic incentives for diverting a minimum of 20 percent of the feed grain base acres is substantially higher under the 1963 provisions, a reasonable estimate is that 75 percent of the corn and barley and 85 percent of the grain sorghum base acreage would participate in the 1963 program. Allowing for the diversion of a substantial number of entire base acreages of less than 25 acres it is estimated that 25 percent of the base acreage on all participating farms would be diverted. If this occurs—I think it is optimistic—acreage diversions in 1963 would compare with intended diversions in 1962.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table showing the comparison may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Intend- ed di- version	Esti- mated di- version	Differ- ence
Corn.....million acres.....	1962 22.9	1963 16.2	-6.7
Grain sorghum.....do.....	6.7	4.4	-2.3
Barley.....do.....	3.1	3.1	0
Total.....do.....	32.7	23.7	-9.0

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS DOUBLE COST OF FEED GRAIN SECTIONS OF PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to show why I think the conference report on the bill would result in a cost twice as high for the taxpayers as the cost would have been under the bill which previously was passed by the Senate.

The cost of acreage diversion payments under the 1962 program have been estimated by USDA at \$900 million. In addition, the Commodity Credit Corporation may take over 600 million bushels—corn equivalent—of 1962 feed grains at \$1.20 per bushel while selling an equal amount at \$1 per bushel, resulting in a net additional cost of \$120 million. The combined acreage diversion payments and CCC losses on loans at \$1.20 per bushel for corn for the 1962 program will approximate \$1,020 million.

- 1962

munist tendencies, we attempted patiently and consistently from early 1959 until late 1960 to negotiate differences with the regime.

Elements in the Castro movement engaged in anti-American activities during the revolution against Batista. Soon after it came to power in 1959, the Castro government turned away from its previous promises, permitted Communist influence to grow, attacked and persecuted its own supporters in Cuba who expressed opposition to communism, arbitrarily seized U.S. properties, and made a series of baseless charges against the United States. It ignored, rejected, or imposed impossible conditions on repeated U.S. overtures to cooperate and negotiate. In 1960 Cuba established close political, economic, and military relationships with the Sino-Soviet bloc, while increasing the pace and vehemence of measures and attacks against the United States. We did not take defensive measures until the last half of 1960.

The United States terminated relations with the Cuban Government in January 1961 because of Cuban demands which placed crippling limitations on our ability to carry out diplomatic and consular functions in Cuba. The adoption by the present Cuban Government of a totalitarian Communist system and its alignment with the international Communist movement, which were already clear at that time, have become more complete since then. These developments culminated in December 1961, when Castro openly espoused Marxism-Leninism.

July 25, 1957: U.S. Ambassador Earl T. Smith, upon presentation of credentials, states that the American people are saddened and concerned over the political unrest which has led to bloodshed in Cuba.

March 14, 1958: U.S. suspends arms arms deliveries to Cuba.

June 22, 1958: Raul Castro, rebel commander in northern Oriente Province, issues a military order for the detention, effective June 27, of all U.S. male citizens for the purpose of "stopping U.S. military shipments to the Batista government." Pursuant to this order, starting June 26 Cuban rebels kidnap 43 U.S. citizens, including 30 sailors and marines, from the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The last of those kidnaped are released July 18.

September-October 1958: Cuban rebels set up a system for levying taxes on both Cuban and United States enterprises operating in rebel-occupied territory in eastern Cuba, and harass several U.S. companies in an attempt to collect funds and acquire supplies and equipment.

October 20, 1958: Cuban rebels kidnap two Americans employed by the Texas Oil Co., and release them 3 days later.

January 1, 1959: President Batista flees Cuba.

January 2, 1959: Fidel Castro proclaims provisional government headed by Manuel Urrutia as President.

January 5, 1959: President Urrutia appoints Jose Miró Cardona as Prime Minister.

January 7, 1959: The United States recognizes the Cuban Government, noting with satisfaction the assurances given of the Cuban intention to comply with international obligations and agreements, and expresses the sincere good will of the Government and people of the United States toward the new government and the people of Cuba.

January 7, 1959: The Communist Party daily Hoy appears in Havana for the first time since 1953.

January 9, 1959: Ernesto Guevara, commander of La Cabafia fortress in Havana, says that many members of the Communist Party lost their lives fighting Batista while the Batista government was receiving weapons from the U.S. Government, and that the Communists have earned the right to be just another party in Cuba.

January 13, 1959: By this date, almost 200 persons have been "tried" by revolutionary

tribunals, found guilty and summarily shot. By the end of 1959, the count is over 600.

January 27, 1959: Nine U.S. companies operating in Cuba have made advance payments of \$2,580,000 on taxes which are not due until March 30.

February 16, 1959: Fidel Castro succeeds Miro Cardona as Prime Minister.

March 2, 1959: U.S. Ambassador Philip W. Bonsal presents credentials. He brings cordial greetings and heartfelt good wishes from President Eisenhower for the happiness, prosperity and progress of Cuba. He states to President Urrutia: "We wish you every success in your announced objective of raising the standard of living of your country. I shall devote particular attention to all opportunities of increased cooperation in the economic field which may present themselves."

March 4, 1959: the Cuban Government intervenes the Cuban Telephone Co., the first intervention of a U.S.-owned firm.

March 16, 1959: Cuban Ambassador Ernesto Dihigo presents credentials. President Eisenhower expresses hope and desire for ever closer relationship between Cuba and the United States.

March 22, 1959: Prime Minister Castro charges that U.S. authorities were lax in keeping track of arms purchases and other activities in the United States directed against Cuba. United States denies charge on March 23.

April 13, 1959: Ambassador Bonsal tells Prime Minister Castro that the United States considers Castro's forthcoming visit to the United States very important, and offers to help in any way required.

April 16, 1959: During lunch given by Secretary of State Christian Herter for Prime Minister Castro in Washington, Assistant Secretary of State Roy R. Rubottom, Jr., in conversation with the president of the Cuban National Bank, Felipe Pazos, arranges further conversations for the following day with Cuban officials.

April 17, 1959: Assistant Secretary Rubottom gives Minister of Economy Regino Boti, Minister of Treasury Rufo Lopez Fresquet, and Pazos friendly welcome and invites them to indicate Cuba's needs. He says the U.S. Government desires to be helpful. The Cubans rebuff offer.

Later the same day Prime Minister Castro, in a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, says he has not come to the United States to ask for money.

May 17, 1959: Cuban Government approves agrarian reform law, providing for taking of agricultural properties, payment to be in 20-year bonds, at 4½-percent interest.

May 27, 1959: Assistant Secretary Rubottom tells Ambassador Dihigo that the United States understands that the Cuban revolution is deep and meaningful for the Cuban people, that its eventual course is matter for their decision, and that we understand the desire and need for land reform.

June 1, 1959: Ambassador Bonsal, in informal conversation with Minister of State Roberto Agramonte, states that the United States supports sound land reform, and recognizes Cuba's right to expropriate private property, provided just and prompt compensation is made. He states that it is in the interest of both Cuba and the United States to work together, to get along amicably, and to afford each other a full hearing before taking actions materially affecting the other.

June 11, 1959: Commenting on Cuban agrarian reform law, United States expresses sympathy for the objectives of agrarian reform; recognizes the right of a state to take property for public purposes, coupled with an obligation to pay prompt, adequate and effective compensation; expresses concern as to the adequacy of the law's provisions for compensation to U.S. citizens whose property may be expropriated; and expresses hope for further exchanges of views.

June 12, 1959: Ambassador Bonsal urges on Prime Minister Castro the importance of close relations between Cuba and the United States because of the interrelated economies and the proximity of the two countries.

June 20, 1959: In Washington, Assistant Secretary Rubottom offers Cuban Minister of State Raul Roa full cooperation in returning problems of United States-Cuban relations to normal, nonpublic diplomatic channels, as advocated by Roa.

June 22, 1959: In Washington, Under Secretary of State C. Douglas Dillon tells Minister of State Roa of the sincere desire of the United States that Cuba grow and prosper, and expresses the hope that the mutually beneficial traditional relationship between the United States and Cuba continue.

June 25, 1959: Cuban Government seizes three U.S.-owned cattle ranches in Camaguey Province, first such seizures subsequent to the agrarian reform law.

June 27, 1959: Cuban Government seizes U.S.-owned cattle ranch in Oriente Province.

July 1, 1959: Maj. Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz resigns as head of the Cuban Air Force, charging Communist infiltration of the armed forces and Government.

July 12, 1959: Prime Minister Castro describes reported appearance of Major Diaz Lanz before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in executive session as an unfriendly act and as U.S. interference in the internal affairs of Cuba.

July 13, 1959: President Urrutia, appearing on television, states that communism is not really concerned with the welfare of the people, and that it constitutes a danger for the Cuban revolution.

July 14, 1959: Major Diaz Lanz testifies publicly before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on communism in Cuba.

July 14, 1959: Acting Minister of State Armando Hart denounces Diaz Lanz appearance before Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as blatant intervention in Cuban internal affairs.

July 17, 1959: In television appearance, Fidel Castro resigns as Prime Minister and accuses President Urrutia of treason because of July 13 speech. Urrutia resigns.

July 23, 1959: Ambassador Bonsal expresses to Minister of State Roa the general sympathy of the United States for the objectives of the Cuban revolution and our support for agrarian reform programs of a sound nature. States that in connection with the Diaz Lanz case, U.S. policy has been correct and faithful to our highest principles. Expresses concern over the deterioration in Cuba-United States relations as a result of anti-American statements of principal Cuban Government leaders. Expresses wish of U.S. Government to cooperate in any way in obtaining information on various incidents.

July 26, 1959: Fidel Castro announces that he will resume position of Prime Minister.

July 31, 1959: On at least six occasions during the month, Cuban Government officials seize or place cattle on land owned by U.S. citizens.

August 15, 1959: Prime Minister Castro charges complicity of U.S. officials in permitting planes participating in counterrevolutionary activities against Cuba to take off from the United States.

August 21, 1959: Assistant Secretary Rubottom emphasizes to Ambassador Dihigo that he believes that the United States and Cuba urgently need to sit down together and talk over various problems to arrive at an understanding.

August 31, 1959: On at least three occasions during the month, Cuban Government officials seize or harvest land owned by U.S. citizens.

September 2, 1959: Deputy Assistant Secretary of State William P. Snow, in conversation with Ambassador Dihigo, expresses regret at the continuing attacks on the United States by Cuban Government officials, con-

cern at the failure of the Cuban Government to hear the views of U.S. business interests before the passage of laws affecting them, and the hope that the Cuban Government might arrive at a better understanding of the U.S. position in defense of democracy against the world Communist conspiracy.

September 3, 1959: In first interview since June 12, Ambassador Bonsal expresses to Prime Minister Castro our general sympathy with the objectives of the revolution, concern at anti-American statements made by Cuban officials and at insinuations by Cuban officials that our relations have not been straightforward and correct, at the treatment received by American interests in Cuba, and at the failure of the Cuban Government to see the implications of international communism.

September 10, 1959: Assistant Secretary Rubottom tells Cuban representative on Inter-American Economic and Social Council, Enrique Perez Cisneros, that the United States is still disposed to carry out a policy of friendship and fairness toward Cuba despite considerable provocation during the past 9 months.

September 21, 1959: Ambassador Dihigo informs Assistant Secretary Rubottom that President Osvaldo Dorticos and Minister of State Roa are completely receptive to the idea that Cuba and the United States begin immediately to discuss their problems and endeavor to arrive at mutually acceptable solutions. He requests that the United States compile a list of the general and specific problems now troubling the United States in its relations with Cuba, and present the list to the Cuban Government. Rubottom indicates his pleasure at this request and says that we will immediately give consideration as how best to meet it.

September 30, 1959: On at least eight occasions during the month, Cuban Government officials seize water system, forest and other lands, and place cattle on land owned by U.S. citizens.

October 6, 1959: Ambassador Bonsal tells Minister of State Roa that the United States is generally in sympathy with the stated democratic social objectives of the Cuban revolution, but also is perplexed and in doubt about Cuban attitudes toward the United States and the free world.

October 12, 1959: United States presents note to Cuban Government reaffirming our understanding and sympathy for the goals which the Cuban Government has declared to be the purpose of its agrarian reform.

October 19, 1959: Maj. Huber Matos, a rebel army leader during the revolution, resigns as military chief of Camaguey Province, charging Communist penetration of the Government. Matos is arrested and on December 15 is sentenced to 20 years in prison for conspiracy, sedition, and treason.

October 21, 1959: Major Diaz Lanz makes an illegal flight from the United States over Havana. Prime Minister Castro charges that the plane bombed and strafed Havana resulting in deaths and injuries.

October 26, 1959: Prime Minister Castro accuses the United States of tolerating air incursions against Cuba and of threatening Cuba with economic strangulation.

October 28, 1959: Cuban Government passes law imposing confiscatory taxes upon the Nicaro nickel facility, owned by the U.S. Government, in violation of a binding international agreement. Subsequently the Cuban Government intermittently embargoes the export of the product and continually harasses the operation by delaying or failing to approve the exportation of the product and the importation of critically needed supplies and replacement parts.

October 27, 1959: Referring to October 21 incident, United States states that the plane distributed leaflets over Havana, that it was impossible for the plane to bomb or strafe, that the Cuban police reported no bombing

or strafing, and that deaths and injuries from the incident must have resulted from Cuban anti-aircraft fire or bombs thrown by terrorists. Rejects implication that the United States approved the flight or was in any way responsible.

October 27, 1959: Ambassador Bonsal tells Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticos and Minister of State Roa that the "United States awaits a resolution by the Cuban Government of the issues involved on a basis of friendship and observance of international law which have traditionally characterized negotiations between Cuba and the United States." Bonsal also expresses the hope that normal negotiations will not be distorted to obscure the deep sympathy with which the entire United States views the efforts of the Cuban people to achieve their social, economic, and political aspirations.

October 31, 1959: On at least 12 occasions during the month, Cuban Government officials seize lands, cattle and equipment, order cattle moved, deny access to pastures, order cutting of timber, open fences and plow up land, and place cattle on land owned by U.S. citizens.

November 6, 1959: Cuban Ministry of State distributes brochure entitled "Cuba Denounces Before the World." Brochure repeats allegations about October 21 plane incident and charges that the United States is providing political asylum to Cuban fugitives from justice.

November 9, 1959: United States protests November 6 brochure as disregarding facts on plane incident. Also states that Cuban Government has never requested extradition of alleged fugitives from justice under extradition treaty with United States.

November 24, 1959: Daniel M. Braddock, Minister-Counselor of American Embassy, Havana, states to Minister of Economy Boti that although various individual matters have been discussed between Cuba and the United States, little or no progress has been made on them. Braddock says that some American companies in Cuba fear that the ultimate intention of the Cuban Government is to take them over.

November 30, 1959: On at least nine occasions during the month, Cuban Government officials seize land, cattle and equipment, and place cattle on land owned by U.S. citizens.

December 4, 1959: Ambassador Bonsal reviews for Minister of Economy Boti the principal events in United States-Cuban relations since October 12, noting the deterioration that has occurred in the meantime. He refers to the Cuban offer of November 13 to continue negotiations on pending questions, and asks if Boti is disposed to resume these discussions. Boti indicates assent.

December 31, 1959: Cuba and Communist China sign trade agreement under which Cuba is to sell Peiping 50,000 tons of sugar.

December 31, 1959: On at least seven occasions during the month, Cuban Government officials seize land, equipment, property, remove timber, borrow equipment (most of which is not returned) and use repair shops owned by U.S. citizens.

January 11, 1960: United States protests seizure of U.S. property in recent weeks by Cuban officials in violation of agrarian reform law. States that without court order or any written authorization, lands and buildings have been seized and occupied; equipment has been confiscated and removed; cattle have been taken; wood has been cut and sold; productive pastures have been plowed under without the consent of their owners; and fences and boundaries have been arbitrarily moved.

January 21, 1960: Prime Minister Castro says that notes from the U.S. State Department and statements by U.S. officials encourage counterrevolutionary activities against Cuba and indicate that a policy of hostility against Cuba is more evident every day. He implies that the United States exploited Cuba for 50 years.

January 26, 1960: President Eisenhower reaffirms the adherence of the United States to the policy of nonintervention in the domestic affairs of other countries, including Cuba; explicitly recognizes the right of the Cuban Government and people to undertake social, economic, and political reforms which, with due regard for their obligations under international law, they may think desirable; and expresses the sympathy of the American people for the aspirations of the Cuban people.

January 27, 1960: Answering President Eisenhower's statement of January 26, President Dorticos states that the Cuban Government is fully disposed to discuss differences between Cuba and the United States through diplomatic negotiations, and will hear and consider complaints and claims regarding individual cases raised by U.S. citizens, in accordance with Cuban and international law.

January 31, 1960: On at least 11 occasions during the month, Cuban Government officials seize a marine dredge, land, stores, cattle and horses, and brand cattle owned by U.S. citizens.

February 4, 1960: Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan arrives to open a Soviet exhibition.

February 4, 1960: Chargé d'Affaires Braddock states to Minister of State Roa that the United States is disposed to take President Dorticos' statement at face value and is prepared to return to diplomatic norms. Braddock mentions the desirability of leading officials of both Cuba and the United States working within the traditional spirit of United States-Cuban friendship, maintaining an atmosphere free of public recriminations, and observing standards of international and domestic laws applicable to each other's nationals.

February 10, 1960: United States states that it considers the January 27 statement of President Dorticos consistent with a desire for a return to normal diplomatic channels and welcomes the readiness of the Cuban Government to negotiate pending problems.

February 13, 1960: Prime Minister Castro and Deputy Premier Mikoyan sign joint Soviet-Cuban communique describing their conversations as "carried out in an atmosphere of frank cordiality."

February 13, 1960: Cuba and Soviet Union sign trade and economic aid agreements. Soviet Union to buy 1 million tons of Cuban sugar in each of ensuing 5 years. Soviet Union extends \$100 million credit for purchase of equipment.

February 15, 1960: Replying to U.S. protest of January 11, Cuban Government states that no property has been confiscated under the agrarian reform law; that where agrarian reform officials have occupied property, steps are being taken for their fair appraisal; and that if the United States considers that Cuban laws have been violated, U.S. nationals have the right to appeal through appropriate channels.

February 15, 1960: Commerce Minister Cepero Bonilla states that the United States pays a premium price for sugar in order to bolster "inefficient and expensive" domestic sugar producers who cannot compete with "efficient and cheap producers such as Cuba."

February 20, 1960: Cuba signs trade and payments agreement with East Germany.

February 22, 1960: Cuban Government announces that it has decided to name a commission to begin negotiations in Washington, under the condition that the legislative and executive branches of the U.S. Government will adopt no measure considered prejudicial to the Cuban economy and people while the negotiations are in progress.

February 24, 1960: Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro blames the United States for exploitation of Cuba since the beginning of the century.

February 29, 1960: United States tells Cuban Government that it wishes to seek a solution of outstanding problems through

Cuban Government has taken discriminatory actions against the property of U.S. citizens in Cuba valued at over \$850 million, and that no effort has been made by the Cuban Government to assure them anything approaching adequate compensation.

August 6, 1960: Under authority of the nationalization law, Cuba nationalizes through forced expropriation the properties of 26 companies wholly or partially owned by U.S. citizens. The United States protests this action on August 8.

August 6, 1960: Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro says Cuba is grateful for Soviet support, and that U.S. aid always has strings attached, while aid from the Soviet Union is disinterested.

August 7, 1960: Prime Minister Castro justifies the confiscation of the investments of U.S. citizens in Cuba by accusing the United States of "economic aggression" in reducing Cuba's sugar quota.

August 10, 1960: United States issues 23-page document containing evidence of the aggressive intent of the Cuban government in its discriminatory trade and financial policies, and its confiscation of the property of U.S. citizens. Estimates the value of confiscated U.S. property at about \$1 billion. States that the backlog of payments due to U.S. exporters because of the failure of Cuban authorities to make the necessary foreign exchange available is over \$100 million. States that about one-half of U.S. investments had been seized before any change was made in the Cuban sugar quota.

Document states that property seized under nationalization law of July 6 covers only the most recent cases of the arbitrary taking of such property without prompt, adequate, and effective compensation. In prior cases, starting in June 1959, the Cuban government has shown little or no consideration for the rights guaranteed property owners under the laws of Cuba. It has seized and occupied lands and buildings of U.S. citizens, confiscated and removed equipment, confiscated and removed cattle from the pastures of owners, seized timberland resources, plowed under productive pastures without the consent of owners, and arbitrarily moved fences and boundaries. In many cases no inventory was taken at the time of seizure nor receipt provided, nor indication given that any payment would be made. The value of American owned property affected by such acts is estimated at \$350 million.

August 13, 1960: Commerce Minister Cepero Bonilla declares that for the coming year "it would be much more advantageous to Cuba if the United States did not buy a single grain of sugar."

August 16, 1960: Cuban press reports on message from Prime Minister Castro to Premier Khrushchev, expressing thanks "for the support of the Soviet people, which is irrefutable proof that the peoples fighting for their independence are not alone in their struggle."

August 24, 1960: Prime Minister Castro charges the United States with supporting counterrevolutionaries and states that Cuba will be friends with the Soviets and the Chinese People's Republic.

August 29, 1960: The Foreign Ministers of the American Republics, meeting at San Jose, Costa Rica, approve Declaration of San Jose, stating that the acceptance by an American state of extracontinental intervention endangers American solidarity and security. They also create an ad hoc good offices committee to help settle controversies between governments in the Americas.

August 29, 1960: Prime Minister Castro repeats charges of United States aggression against Cuba and says he will not renounce Soviet support.

September 2: In reply to the Declaration of San Jose, Prime Minister Castro presents "Declaration of Habana," which bitterly attacks the United States and the OAS, de-

nounces United States intervention in Latin America, accepts offer of assistance from the Soviet Union, and denies that the Soviet Union or Communist China have interventionist intentions in the Western Hemisphere. States Cuba will establish relations with the Chinese People's Republic.

September 12, 1960: United States offers to present its charges for examination by the good offices committee created August 29, and express the hope that the Cuban government will cooperate.

September 15, 1960: Cuba and Hungary sign trade and payments agreements.

September 17, 1960: Under authority of the nationalization law, Cuba nationalizes 3 U.S.-owned banks through forced expropriation. United States protests on September 29.

September 18, 1960: National Bank President Guevara accuses the United States of aggression and genocide. Says that Cuba has received arms from Czechoslovakia and is expecting many more from any power that will sell them.

September 23, 1960: Cuba and North Korea establish diplomatic relations.

September 26, 1960: Prime Minister Castro makes series of untrue and distorted allegations against the United States at the U.N. General Assembly.

September 30, 1960: Communist Prime Minister Chou En-lai states that "in the event of necessity the Chinese government and people will give all possible support and aid to the Cuban people."

October 7, 1960: Cuba and Bulgaria sign trade and payments agreements.

October 12, 1960: United States submits document to the U.N. Secretary General entitled "Facts Concerning Relations Between Cuba and the United States," replying to Prime Minister Castro's allegations of September 26.

October 13, 1960: Unidentified men raid the Cuban consulate general in Miami. Cuban Government states that the attack was permitted with the "suspicious indifference" and the "manifest collusion of the American authorities" and that the identities of those responsible are known to the authorities.

October 19, 1960: United States prohibits exports to Cuba except for nonsubsidized foodstuffs, medicines and medical supplies, to defend the legitimate economic interests of the people of the United States against the discriminatory, aggressive, and injurious economic policies of the Castro regime.

October 24, 1960: Under authority of the nationalization law, Cuba nationalizes through forced expropriation 166 properties wholly or partially owned by U.S. citizens. United States protests on November 19.

October 26, 1960: Cuba and Rumania establish diplomatic relations and sign trade and technical assistance agreements.

October 27, 1960: United States rejects "emphatically and categorically" the Cuban protest of October 13. States that the United States does not condone the violation of its laws by anyone, that it makes every effort to prevent such violations, that an investigation into the incident is continuing and that the United States has told the Miami police of the need for special police protection for the consulate general.

October 28, 1960: United States reiterates September 12 offer to cooperate with good offices committee and expresses hope that committee will carry out its mission promptly.

November 14, 1960: Cuban Government rejects the United States statements of October 27 as "mendacious and detrimental" and refers to an "alliance" between the executioners of the Cuban people and the United States Government.

November 18, 1960: United States states that at least 12 Soviet ships have delivered arms and ammunition to Cuba since July

1960 and that Soviet bloc arms provided to Cuba amount to at least 28,000 tons.

December 2, 1960: Cuba and North Vietnam establish diplomatic relations.

December 9, 1960: Cuba and Outer Mongolia establish diplomatic relations.

December 11, 1960: National Bank President Guevara expresses wholehearted support for the December 6 statement of the Congress of 81 Communist Parties which met in Moscow, and states that Cuba "should follow the example of peaceful development set by the Soviet Union."

December 15, 1960: Cuba and Albania establish diplomatic relations.

December 16, 1960: President Eisenhower fixes the Cuban sugar quota at zero for the first quarter of 1961.

December 17, 1960: Cuba and Hungary establish diplomatic relations.

December 19, 1960: Cuba and the Soviet Union sign joint communique through which Cuba openly aligns itself with the domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet Union and indicates its solidarity with the Sino-Soviet bloc.

January 2, 1961: Cuba holds military parade. Many Soviet and bloc arms displayed, including tanks, assault guns and field guns. Prime Minister Castro says this represents only a "small part" of the arms which Cuba has received from the bloc.

January 2, 1961: Prime Minister Castro demands that the U.S. Embassy in Havana be reduced to 11 officials within 48 hours.

January 3, 1961: United States terminates diplomatic and consular relations with Cuba in view of Castro's demand of January 2, which placed crippling limitations on the ability of the United States to carry out normal diplomatic and consular functions. Cuba turns over its diplomatic and consular affairs to the Embassy of Czechoslovakia in Washington.

February 23, 1961: Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro declares that the Chinese People's Republic has sent Cuba hundreds of machineguns.

March 31, 1961: President Kennedy fixes the Cuban sugar quota at zero for 1961.

April 3, 1961: The United States issues "Cuba" pamphlet, expressing determination to support future democratic governments in Cuba to help the Cuban people achieve freedom, democracy, and social justice, and calling on the Castro regime to sever its links with the international Communist movement.

April 3, 1961: Department states in "Cuba" pamphlet that since mid-1960 more than 30,000 tons of arms, with an estimated value of \$50 million, have arrived in Cuba from beyond the Iron Curtain; that the Cuban armed forces are dependent on the Soviet bloc for the maintenance of their armed power; that Soviet and Czech military advisers and technicians have accompanied the flow of arms; that Cubans have gone to Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union for training as jet pilots, ground maintenance crews, and artillerymen; and that Cuba has, except for the United States, the largest ground forces in the hemisphere, at least 10 times as large as those maintained by previous Cuban Governments, including that of Batista.

April 16, 1961: Prime Minister Castro describes his regime as socialist.

April 17-19, 1961: Cuban patriots fall in attempt to redeem the independence of their homeland.

April 20, 1961: President Kennedy states that any unilateral American intervention would have been contrary to our traditions and to our international obligations, but that we do not intend to abandon Cuba.

April 21, 1961: Cuba votes with the Soviet bloc on almost every major international issue during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations, which ran from Sep-

1962

negotiations, but cannot accept the condition proposed by the Cuban Government that no measure of a unilateral character be adopted by the legislative or executive branch of the U.S. Government, and wishes to explore the subjects to be discussed before initiating negotiations.

March 2, 1960: National Bank President Ernesto Guevara states that the 3 million tons of sugar which Cuba sells annually to the United States "at supposedly preferential prices" have meant and mean slavery for the people of Cuba.

March 4, 1960: French munitions ship *La Coubre* explodes in Habana harbor. On March 5 Prime Minister Castro identifies the United States as the responsible agent of the explosion.

March 7, 1960: The United States categorically and emphatically denies the charge by Prime Minister Castro implying involvement of the U.S. Government in the *La Coubre* disaster.

March 9, 1960: Secretary of State Herter states at press conference that "we have been hopeful throughout that the atmosphere of our relationship with Cuba would allow us to settle through diplomatic means such differences as we may have with Cuba."

March 15, 1960: United States expresses shock and dismay at Prime Minister Castro's attributing responsibility for *La Coubre* disaster to United States; rejects Castro's suggestion that the United States wants to keep Cuba defenseless in order to oppress Cuba; states that it is prepared to discuss various other matters, on which Castro has been critical of the United States through normal channels of communication; and continues to hope that the United States and Cuba can settle their differences through diplomatic means.

March 20, 1960: National Bank President Guevara states "Our war * * * is against the great power of the north."

March 20, 1960: Plane from the United States leaves Fort Lauderdale, and is damaged by Cuban gunfire as it lands on a highway in Cuba the next day. U.S. grand jury later indicts William J. Shergalis, a U.S. citizen, and Hector Garcia Soto, both of whom arranged for the flight, for acting as agents of the Cuban Government without filing the registration statement required by law.

March 31, 1960: Cuba signs trade and payments agreement with Poland.

April 11, 1960: United States asks Cuban Government if the March 2 views of National Bank President Guevara on sugar represent the official Cuban position. No reply ever received from Cuban Government.

April 19, 1960: Prime Minister Castro states that the U.S. Government takes advantage of every opportunity to create confusion with respect to United States-Cuban relations. He states that the U.S. Government seems to have adopted the policy used in the past to encourage fascism.

April 19, 1960: The first shipment of Soviet crude oil arrives in Cuba on the Soviet tanker *Vishinsky*.

May 6, 1960: Cuban Coast Guard patrol vessel fires without warning upon U.S. submarine *Sea Poacher* on the high seas 11 miles from the Cuban coast.

May 8, 1960: Cuba and the Soviet Union establish diplomatic relations.

May 13, 1960: Prime Minister Castro, referring to *Sea Poacher* incident of May 6, states that the Cuban Coast Guard cutter *Oriente* sighted a U.S. submarine 5 miles off the Cuban coast. In the same speech Castro states that 3 miles is the limit of Cuban territorial waters.

May 14, 1960: United States expresses astonishment and protest to Cuban Government over *Sea Poacher* incident and requests explanation. On June 11 Prime Minister Castro says that no explanation will be given.

May 16, 1960: Cuba and Czechoslovakia establish diplomatic relations.

May 17, 1960: National Bank of Cuba informs U.S. oil companies in Cuba that each of them will be required to purchase 300,000 tons of Russian petroleum during the balance of 1960.

May 17, 1960: Minister-Counselor Brad-dock reminds Cuban Under Secretary of State Fernandez Font that Minister of State Roa told Ambassador Bonsal that Roa would be soon getting in touch with Bonsal to resume discussions on the possibility of negotiations on pending problems.

June 4, 1960: United States reviews the record of the Cuban Government's campaign of slander against the United States, and the efforts of the United States to maintain its traditionally friendly relations with the people of Cuba. The record includes Cuban confiscation and expropriation of U.S. property, failure of the Cuban Government to compensate U.S. property owners, payments due to American exporters, Cuban attacks on U.S. sugar premium, air incursions, and the *La Coubre* and *Sea Poacher* incidents.

June 7, 1960: United States objects to "fallacious" and "offense" Cuban Government pamphlet containing thinly veiled charges implying U.S. Government involvement in *La Coubre* disaster.

June 8, 1960: Antonio Nufiez Jimenez, Director of the Agrarian Reform Institute, says in Moscow that of all the Latin American countries, Cuba is "the Soviet Union's greatest and most loyal friend."

June 9, 1960: Prime Minister Castro, referring to the United States, says that powerful interests which wanted to destroy the revolution provoked the *La Coubre* incident. He calls this type of disaster "criminally conceived and executed."

June 10, 1960: Cuban Government seizes four U.S.-owned hotels in Habana.

June 10, 1960: Cuba signs 5-year trade and payment agreements with Czechoslovakia.

June 10, 1960: Prime Minister Castro states that U.S. officials participated in a plot to mount an invasion attempt in Cuba against Nicaragua under the leadership of a Nicaraguan exile, for the purpose of embarrassing the Cuban Government. United States allegations are false.

June 10, 1960: Cuban Minister of State Roa says in Montevideo that Cuba decided "to break the structure of its commercial relations with the United States."

June 15, 1960: Cuba and Poland establish diplomatic relations.

June 18, 1960: Joint Cuban-Soviet communiqué in Moscow notes the fruitful development of trade, economic, and cultural ties between the Soviet Union and Cuba.

June 18, 1960: Agrarian Reform Director Nufiez Jimenez states "The Communist Party of Cuba is * * * the party whose members are receiving the benefits of the revolution."

June 27, 1960: United States explains the unusual precautions it has taken against illegal air incursions from U.S. territory affecting Cuba. States that the Cuban Government has shown no recognition of these efforts, has continued to picture the United States as permitting and encouraging these incursions, and has never provided the United States with data which would aid in investigating the incursions.

June 27, 1960: United States submits memorandum to the Inter-American Peace Committee on provocative actions of the Cuban Government. Memorandum mentions *La Coubre* incident, *Sea Poacher* incident, air incursions, and false Cuban allegations of U.S. complicity in plot to invade Nicaragua.

June 29, 1960: Cuban Government seizes Texaco and Esso refineries, on grounds that they had violated Cuban law in refusing to refine Soviet crude oil. As of this date, the oil companies had voluntarily financed over \$50 million worth of crude oil imports for which the Cuban Government had refused to release dollars.

July 3, 1960: Agrarian Reform Director Nufiez Jimenez states in East Berlin that Cuba desires relations not only with the Soviet Union but with all Socialist countries.

July 3, 1960: U.S. Congress gives President authority to reduce import quota on Cuban sugar.

July 3, 1960: Jose Miró Cardona, Ambassador-designate to the United States, resigns, stating that "the ideological differences between the plans of the Government * * * and my conscience were impossible to resolve." He takes asylum in the Argentine Embassy.

July 5, 1960: United States protests seizure of U.S.-owned oil refineries as arbitrary, inequitable, and contrary to Cuban law, and expresses the hope that the Cuban Government will rescind these actions.

July 6, 1960: Cuban Government passes nationalization law, authorizing nationalization of U.S.-owned property through expropriation. Authorizes payment to be made from fund to be derived from receipts from annual purchases of Cuban sugar over 3 million tons, at price of at least 5.75 cents a pound. Payment to be in 30-year bonds at 2-percent interest.

July 6, 1960: President Eisenhower, "with the most genuine regret," orders a cut of 700,000 tons in Cuba's 1960 sugar quota, on grounds that Cuban commitments to pay for Soviet goods with Cuban sugar have raised serious doubts as to whether the United States can depend on Cuba as a source of sugar.

July 7, 1960: Prime Minister Castro says that the United States acted in a "frenzy of impotence and hatred * * * in a fit of rage" in cutting the sugar quota, but defies the United States and says that his revolution will triumph.

July 9, 1960: Soviet Premier Khrushchev states that the U.S.S.R. is "raising its voice and extending a helpful hand to the people of Cuba * * *. Speaking figuratively, in case of necessity, Soviet artillerymen can support the Cuban people with rocket fire."

July 9, 1960: President Eisenhower says that Khrushchev's statement underscores the close ties that have developed between the Soviet and Cuban Governments.

July 10, 1960: Prime Minister Castro devotes an entire speech to expressing satisfaction at the support offered Cuba by the Soviet Union and to attaching what he describes as the aggressive policies of the United States.

July 10, 1960: National Bank President Guevara states that Cuba is defended by the Soviet Union, "the greatest military power in history."

July 10, 1960: President DORTICOS hails "the message of solidarity spoken by the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union and coming to us in our most difficult hour."

July 16, 1960: U.S. protests nationalization law of July 6 as discriminatory, arbitrary and confiscatory.

July 21, 1960: Cuban press reports Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro stating in Moscow that Cuba "is grateful for political and moral support from the Soviet Union."

July 23, 1960: Cuba signs a 5-year trade and payment agreement with Communist China, calling for Chinese Communist purchase of 500,000 tons of Cuban sugar in each of the next 5 years.

July 30, 1960: National Bank President Guevara states that the U.S.S.R., Communist China, and other Socialist countries are Cuba's friends.

August 1, 1960: United States submits document to the Inter-American Peace Committee entitled "Responsibility of Cuban Government for Increased International Tensions in the Hemisphere." Document deals principally with the relations between Cuba and the Sino-Soviet bloc, and the emergence of a dictatorial pattern of political control in Cuba. Document states that the

19332

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 24

surplus military equipment that was left over from World War II. The War Assets Administration estimated that the property requested ranged in value between \$275 and \$300 million.

The chairman acted promptly and introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 of the 80th Congress, requesting the military departments and the War Assets Administration to delay the disposal of surplus lands and permanent structures and to report their locations, description, and fair market value to the Armed Services Committees of the U.S. Congress.

As a result, the chairman set up an investigating committee composed of myself, Senator Robertson, of Wyoming, and Senator BYRD of Virginia. We held hearings on February 16 and 17 and March 2, 3, and 8, of 1948, and after we had heard the evidence, wrote a report and made recommendations to the Senate.

Our report recommended, on the basis of our study, that the Surplus Property Act of 1944 be amended to require the following:

First. That conveyances to States and local governments for public parks and recreational areas shall be at at 50 percent of fair market value.

Second. That conveyances for historical monuments of Federal property shall be without monetary consideration.

Third. That the United States reserve valuable rights in connection with this property, such as reversionary and other interests as conditions upon any transfers.

Our recommendations were in the form of a bill, S. 2277, which became Public Law 616 of the 80th Congress on June 10, 1948. This legislative formula became accepted and was extended in 1949, to the General Property and Administrative Services Act, section 602(a) of Public Law 152, 81st Congress.

Therefore, this formula which was devised by our committee, was enacted into law and applies to every transfer of property which is undertaken by the General Services Administration, or any related agency concerned with either the Surplus Property Acts, relating to military property, or the General Property and Administrative Services Act, relating to Government property generally.

From time to time since 1948, questions have arisen as to why it is necessary for the Senator from Oregon to take the floor and apply or insist on compliance with this formula, if it is already part of legislation and has the force of law.

The answer to this is that every piece of special legislation relating to the conveyance of land stands on an equal footing legally with the original legislation. No Congress can bind its successor and therefore a bill to provide for the conveyance of land would and does override the General Property Act or any other legislation that can be put on the books.

In addition to the estimate that in round numbers the Morse formula has made a saving of \$500 million for the taxpayers, in respect to 888 square miles of land, or 568,811 acres, plus the estimate of an additional \$150 million already referred to by the senior Senator

from Oregon, many more millions of dollars have been saved to the taxpayers as a result of the fact that the principle of the Morse formula became a part of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and is binding, as far as departmental action is concerned, on the General Services Administration in carrying out the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act.

We have no way of knowing how many millions of dollars of savings have resulted from the adoption of the amendment to the General Property Act which I authored and which was supported by former Senator Robertson of Wyoming and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. It was added as an amendment to the Surplus Property Act and was adopted in 1948. However, my estimate is that well over a total of \$900 million has been saved to the taxpayers of this country as a result of my insistence upon the application of the Morse formula to so-called special legislation and the application of the formula now as a part of the General Property Act by the agencies of Government that have the administrative responsibility of carrying out the provisions of legislation over which they have jurisdiction.

Also, I may say for the benefit of the Library of Congress and its Legislative Reference Service, and for the benefit of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHERL] and my other colleagues in the Senate, that there has never been a bill passed by the Senate while the senior Senator from Oregon has been on the floor of the Senate, that violated the Morse formula to which I did not object.

I have already referred to the 11 bills that the Library of Congress reported to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHERL] as allegedly having passed the Senate, as not including the Morse formula, when the principle of the Morse formula was, in fact, involved. I have already stated that the Library of Congress was dead wrong and it listed six of those bills as having passed the Senate without the Morse formula, when in fact the Morse formula was involved.

The Record and the September 1962 memorandum by the Legislative Reference Service shows that in the case of six of the bills there was a discussion of the Morse formula, in which the senior Senator from Oregon made clear that the Federal Government was getting value equal to the 50 percent of the appraised market value in connection with each one of those bills.

As to the other bills, it is not the fault of the Senator from Oregon if he is away from the Senate on official business when a bill which violates the Morse formula is called up, and the Senator from Oregon is not even aware of either the bill or the fact that it will be called up. I merely say that, in my judgment, the leadership of the Senate, knowing of the record that the senior Senator from Oregon has made on this very important principle of protecting the economic interests of the taxpayers, should not allow a bill to come up if it knows that the bill violates the Morse formula.

I repeat, for the benefit of the Library of Congress, the senior Senator from

California [Mr. KUCHERL], and other Senators, that I have never knowingly or intentionally permitted a bill to pass the Senate on the Unanimous Consent Calendar or on motion, in violation of the Morse formula without arguing against the passage of such a bill.

When a special bill which violates the Morse formula is called up, it becomes necessary for me to take the floor of the Senate when such a bill makes its appearance and take action to make certain that the formula created by our committee is written into each of the special bills. During the 80th Congress there developed more or less of an understanding among us that the then junior Senator from Oregon would fight this battle on the floor of the Senate, and I have been doing it ever since, for 14 years now.

During this decade and a half, the formula has developed and been refined. Its basic tenets have been expanded so that now in addition to the provision for the free conveyance of property for historical monuments and the provision for payment of 50 percent of fair market value by the State and local governments for public parks and recreational areas, there is added a provision that conveyances to Government units for commercial operations or any conveyance to private individuals or organizations for profitable purposes, shall require a payment to the Treasury of the full 100 percent market value of the property at the time of the conveyance.

In addition, provision for such interests as mineral rights, rights of concurrent use and other valuable legal interests have become part of the formula.

It has not always been easy to stand up in the Senate and oppose bills embodying projects which have a great deal of interest for the residents of a particular State or locality and the sponsorship of esteemed colleagues in the Senate. These measures are often extremely popular within the State or locality, since there might be exceedingly valuable property which would be enjoyed free of compensation if one of these bills became law.

However, the Senator from Oregon is one person who believes that the property belonging to the U.S. taxpayer wherever he is situated is deserving of protection. It does not matter that in many of these bills the amount of property involved is quite small. In the words of Robbie Burns, "many a mickle makes a muckle." As we have seen the "mickles" have added up over the past 14 years to an area more than two-thirds the size of Rhode Island.

If this property had been transferred away from Federal ownership without compensation, it is quite likely that there would be even more legislation introduced to confer similar benefits on other localities, and the amount of the taxpayers which would be given away in this fashion, might soon reach dizzying proportions.

In recognition of this, a good many Members of this body have extended the utmost cooperation in introducing legislation with the Morse formula already written in. In other cases, after the applicability of the formula is brought

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19331

tember 20 to December 20, 1960, and March 7 to April 21, 1961.

April 30, 1961: Minister of Industries Ernesto Guevara declares that the Castro movement was "the first socialist revolution in Latin America."

May 1, 1961: Prime Minister Castro speaks of "our socialist revolution" and says that a new "socialist constitution" will be prepared for Cuba.

July 26, 1961: Prime Minister Castro announces formation of Integrated Revolutionary Organizations (ORI) as the precursor of the United Party of the Socialist Revolution, to be the only party in Cuba.

September 20, 1961: Soviet-Cuban communiqué proclaims "identity of positions of the Soviet Union and Cuba on all the international questions that were discussed."

October 2, 1961: Chinese-Cuban communiqué proclaims complete agreement between the Cuban and Chinese Communist regimes on "the current international situation and the question of further developing friendship and cooperation."

December 2, 1961: Prime Minister Castro states: "I believe absolutely in Marxism * * * I am a Marxist-Leninist and will be a Marxist-Leninist until the last day of my life." He admits that he hid his true political ideology during his revolutionary struggle because he felt that "if we, when we began to have strength, had been known as people of very radical ideas, unquestionably all the social classes that are making war on us would have been doing so from that time on."

December 6, 1961: United States submits document to the Inter-American Peace Committee entitled "The Castro Regime in Cuba," containing information on Cuba's ties with the Sino-Soviet bloc and her threat to independent governments in the Western Hemisphere.

December 20, 1961: Cuba votes with Soviet bloc on 83 out of 37 major issues in 16th session of U.N. General Assembly.

January 14, 1962: The Inter-American Peace Committee reports that Cuba's connections with the Sino-Soviet bloc are incompatible with Inter-American treaties, principles, and standards.

January 31, 1962: The Foreign Ministers of the American Republics, meeting at Punta del Este, declare that as a consequence of its public alignment with the international Communist movement, the present Marxist-Leninist government of Cuba is excluded from participation in the Inter-American system.

March 27, 1962: United States states that Sino-Soviet bloc has furnished about \$100 million worth of military equipment and technical services to Cuba and that several hundred Cuban military personnel have received training, including pilot training, in the bloc. Arms include 5 to 75 Mig jet fighters; 150 to 250 tanks; 50 to 100 assault guns; 500 to 1,000 field artillery; 500 to 1,000 anti-aircraft artillery; 500 mortars; 200,000 small arms; and some patrol vessels and torpedo boats. No evidence of missiles, missile bases, or bombers.

MORSE FORMULA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues in the Senate know, I have, since my first term in the Senate during the 80th Congress, steadfastly attempted to protect the public interest in the disposition of surplus Government property through adding to proposed legislation what is generally termed "the Morse formula" amendment.

I am frank to say that I have not always been successful in my efforts, but

I think the record will show that I have tried hard to achieve success.

On August 9, I engaged in friendly colloquy and debate with the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] about the Morse formula in connection with its application to a bill he was then pressing to have adopted. During that discussion he cited certain bills which passed the Senate without having had attached to them this provision. He had obtained his information from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, as is perfectly proper. That is the reason why the Service was established. The tabulation showed 11 bills approved in the Senate without the Morse formula. The full summaries of these bills prepared by the Reference Service on September 4, 1962, further indicate that as to 6 of these bills, I took the floor to announce my judgment that the legislation fully complied with the Morse formula, and that the Government and the taxpayer received fair value for the property which the bills sought to convey.

It is regrettable that the Legislative Reference Service did not see fit apparently in its August 9, 1962, report to take note of what the record and its own September 4, 1962, report fully showed in regard to those 6 bills, namely that in 6 of the 11 cases there was a floor discussion and explanation of the fact that the Morse formula requirements were achieved.

I have also used the Legislative Reference Service to obtain information many times in the past and I hope to do so often in the future. But, since I believe that for the sake of future discussions in the Senate when this question may again arise it will be helpful to have available a full compilation of Morse formula legislation, I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library to compile for me a memorandum of all legislation from the 80th through the 86th Congress to which the Morse formula would be applicable.

This tabulation indicates that since 1947, the Morse formula has been applied to 436 pieces of legislation which sought to convey real estate or personal property belonging to the Government and the taxpayers of the United States. The history of these 436 bills does not tell the whole story, however, since they are only the bills which eventually were enacted into law. The Library of Congress memorandum does not go into the area of bills which were withdrawn or were never offered because of the presence and potential application of the Morse formula. At any rate, it is interesting to do a little arithmetic with regard to these 436 bills.

As to real estate alone, these bills sought to convey real property of the United States estimated at approximately 568,811 acres. This amounts to about 888 square miles or more than two-thirds of the total area of the State of Rhode Island. Included within this 888-square-mile area has been land of modest value such as 462 acres of Alaskan land valued at \$1.25 an acre. There has also been

some extremely valuable land, such as .86 acres of land at Palm Beach, Fla., which was valued at \$18,750. Some of this land has contained valuable improvements such as observation towers, lighthouses, and pumping stations. In 1960, during the 86th Congress, it was necessary to apply the Morse formula to a bill which would have granted 4½ acres in the most expensive section of Washington, D.C., opposite the British Embassy, to the Congressional Wives Club for a clubhouse of their own. After I insisted, on the floor of the Senate that the Congress should require payments of the full rental value to the U.S. Treasury, this bill was withdrawn. Consequently, this 4½ acres remains part of a beautiful Federal park which all the taxpayers of the United States can enjoy when they come to Washington, D.C.

The so-called Morse formula, as it has evolved, has come to apply to all property interests, real, personal, and mixed, which belong to the Federal Government and the taxpayers of this Nation. Recent application of it has even extended to a fishing vessel which is the property of the U.S. Government.

Getting out my pencil and doing a little calculating on the basis of this Legislative Reference Service memorandum, it appears that averaging on the basis of the stated value of acreage in the memorandum, the Morse formula has resulted in a return to the U.S. Treasury of at least \$439,706,000.

Again this does not tell the whole story. In 98 cases in this memorandum, neither the value nor the acreage of the property involved is stated, so interpolation is required. Further, there is no accounting of the legislation which has been rejected, or not offered because of the possibility applying the formula. If I were pressed for an estimate of the additional amount involved, I might, on the basis of my 18 years of experience in this body, estimate it to be in the neighborhood of \$150 million, although this cannot be stated with exactness.

Scores of these bills have been introduced in Congress every year. They propose to give away Federal land, or in some cases Federal buildings, Federal equipment, and Federal property. Nearly always, the property in question is not being used at the time by the Federal Government. But this does not make it any the less valuable.

If the Government has no need for it, and the local community or State agency or private organization does have a need for it, then I am perfectly favorable to its transfer, but certainly not for no price at all. We do not expect owners of valuable private property to give what they have away for nothing. Why in the world anyone expects the American taxpayers to give away their property for nothing is hard to understand.

The origin of applying the so-called Morse formula is quite illuminating. Back in 1947, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee received word from the War Assets Administration that that agency had received more than 100 requests for the free transfer of

terest in strict compliance with safety regulations.

I am concerned about this evidence, indicating as it does, a broad pattern of violations of the ICC regulations by Western Transportation Co. and its employees. I am concerned over reports that indicate this may not be the only firm involved in a rather massive disregard for safety regulations.

However, I am even more concerned over the lack of a fast and efficient followthrough by the ICC after the complaints were called to the attention of officials of that Government agency.

It was as early as last spring that some of these drivers had contact with ICC officials to explain that agency regulations were being flagrantly violated.

The drivers state that at that time they produced books and records to document their statements on the widespread violations. With this evidence and testimony available, the ICC official declined to accept the books and records which were offered to him and no statements were taken from the drivers at that time. The drivers were simply told that the complaints would be called to the attention of proper ICC officials; that there would be an investigation at a later time.

At the time the drivers called on me, about 6 months later, they had not been contacted by the ICC investigators. These men are asking now if the ICC is interested in following up clear evidence of violation of ICC safety regulations.

As they repeated their story to me, it raised serious questions in my mind about the efficiency and the effectiveness of the ICC in these matters.

Is not this Government agency interested in obtaining evidence indicating such violations of important regulations of the ICC?

The Congress is often told by Government agencies of the difficulty of obtaining evidence of violations of rules, and this is given as the reason—or excuse—for not doing a proper job of administration or enforcement.

Here we have a case in which a number of Iowa truckdrivers have disregarded the personal problem for themselves in producing evidence that their employer has directed them to violate ICC regulations and to make false reports to a Government agency.

To me it is always a serious matter when there is evidence that any business, any union, or any person is involved in the deliberate filing of false information with a Government agency. The Billie Sol Estes case with the false financial statements should be sufficient warning of the many problems that can come from either the favoritism or the negligence that permits such practices. The Agriculture Department's disregard for FBI reports on the Billie Sol Estes operations, and the lack of a diligent followthrough on the cotton allotment problem, should serve as sufficient warning to the Congress, the ICC, and every other department of Government.

When there is a lack of a followthrough, I think it is necessary to ask: Is it incompetence? Is it negligence? Is it some type of collusion or favoritism? Or, is the motivation even worse?

A number of Government agencies have responsibility in this case involving the evidence of falsification of reports by Western Transport Co. drivers.

These drivers have been diligent. They have called the problem to the attention of the National Labor Relations Board, the Chicago regional office of the ICC, and the Justice Department.

The FBI is the only agency that has given the matter any more than routine attention. FBI agents did exhibit an interest, and did question the drivers extensively. However, the FBI has followed its basic procedure of referring the matter to the responsible regulatory agency—the ICC.

This is a matter in which I am vitally interested for these reasons:

First. The public safety is involved.

Second. Laws and regulations are being violated, and complaints are being ignored.

I intend to follow this through in a vigorous manner to assure that all negligence or favoritism is put in the public spotlight.

The basis of the drivers' charges follows:

ICC regulations, devised to promote driving safety, state that a man must have 8 hours off-duty after driving 10 hours.

There also is a rule that an employee cannot work more than 70 hours, driving or otherwise, in any 8 consecutive days.

The protesting drivers say these rules have not been observed.

They support their contentions with payroll records that show they were paid on countless occasions for work far in excess of that allowed by the ICC.

Hobbs said:

When drivers drive excessive hours, one man can do a job that it actually takes two men to do if the ICC rules are followed, so more freight can be handled faster, with fewer men.

Drivers have carbon copies of payroll time sheets that show the trips for which they were paid, day by day. They also have carbon copies of ICC log books showing hours worked and trips taken each day.

The information on the two documents should coincide.

They don't come close time after time, because the men responsible for the company's filings at ICC don't want the log books to show the excessive miles actually driven.

Ulm added:

When I was hired, I was told about this method of logging.

Hobbs and Shrope said they were told the same thing.

Shrope estimated that he falsified the log book "on the average of three times a week" for the 10 years he has worked at Western—until violations "dropped off late in March after word got around of our protests."

Paul Watkins, safety director for Western, sent a notice to all drivers last April 6 stating:

It has come to our attention that several of you are not filling out your log sheets properly.

The notice reminded drivers that convictions of such violations carry maximum penalties "as high as \$5,000 for

each violation" for both the motor carrier and the driver.

Watkins said:

Effective at once, your logs must be made out properly.

Griggs illustrated the violations:

His copy of the Western Transportation payroll time sheet for last September 18 showed he was paid on that day for driving from Chicago to Davenport, Clinton, Ottumwa, Newton, and Des Moines, a total of 485 miles.

That trip took about 17½ hours—

Said Griggs—

and 11½ of it was driving time.

Griggs' ICC log book for that date, however, showed he was off duty the entire day.

Ulm's records produce other comparable situations.

Example: Ulm's payroll time sheet for last September 22 shows he was paid for driving from Webster City to Moline and on to Chicago, totaling 395 miles.

But the ICC log showed he was off duty 17 hours and spent 7 hours driving from Chicago to Clinton and back—290 miles.

There was an omission of 195 miles of actual driving on the daily log, Ulm noted.

Ulm said he got a fast initiation on his first day of work on March 8, 1960.

There was a snowstorm that day and the next.

Ulm said, however, that he drove 760 miles within the next 31½ hours, starting from Chicago at 7:30 p.m. on March 8, 1960, and returning to Chicago at 3 a.m. March 10.

In between, he had driven to Newton, Des Moines, Marshalltown, and Waterloo, Iowa.

I had about 3 hours sleep out of the 31½.

He said.

Lots of Western drivers object to this deal—

Said Hobbs—

but they fear for their jobs. They have families and tractor payments [Western drivers own their own tractors and lease them to the firm] and need the work.

Our cheating is common knowledge along the road. Others laugh at us; some are sore.

Mr. Hobbs said a newspaper item last May "sort of got to us."

It concerned a \$1,700 fine levied against the Wenger Truck Lines of Beaver, Iowa, on 12 counts of failing to require drivers to prepare daily logs properly.

Hobbs said:

Three drivers for Wenger were fined, too. We couldn't figure out how Western Transportation could get by with it when a small operator like Wenger couldn't.

TO BE INCLUDED AS A CAPTIVE NATION—CONGRESS TO AMEND PUBLIC LAW 86-90

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1959, Congress enacted Public Law 86-90, known as the Captive Nations

Week declaration. That action by Congress was both historic and far reaching in its intent. It was based upon the historic traditions of our Nation, as the citadel of human freedom, as the political wellspring of the national independence movement and as the beacon of peace with justice for all nations and peoples. Basic to that law is official recognition that the aggressive and imperial policies of Russian communism seek to destroy individual liberties and independence of nations everywhere in the world, and thereby stand as a constant threat to the shaky peace of our times.

The enactment of Public Law 86-90 signaled an awakening to the realities of the dangers facing our country. In years past, Soviet Russia was posed, by a trick of history, as an ally of the United States. That same trick of history described Soviet Russia as peace loving, as a friend of human freedom, and even as an advocate of democracy. World War II introduced that trick of history to American thinking. Public Law 86-90 exposed that trick and put our Nation aright concerning the history, the objectives, and the worldwide conspiracy of imperial Russian communism.

Nikita Khrushchev was both shocked and adamant at our Government for wiping away the cobwebs of Russian propaganda from the American scene. Former Vice President Nixon was in Moscow at the time Congress enacted, and President Eisenhower signed into law, the declaration on Captive Nations Week. It will be recalled that Khrushchev asked Nixon, "How could you do this to us?" When Nixon seemed unable to supply the answers, Khrushchev then challenged him in what later became known as the kitchen debate. The edited version of that TV debate, shown in part to the American people, did not include the full dialog on the issue of the captive nations. Had it been included the American people today would have a fuller appreciation of the importance of the captive nations to our national security.

Nevertheless, Khrushchev has maintained a running barrage ever since against Public Law 86-90. To raise the question publicly is to touch the open nerve of the Russian international conspiracy—the raw nerve of colonialism and imperialism.

For 1 week each year, large numbers of Americans expose and trample upon the open nerve of the Russian international conspiracy. They do that by holding public observances as called for in Public Law 86-90, in which our Nation rededicates itself to the just aspirations of the captive nations for a return of their freedom and their national independence. It is no comfort to the men in the Kremlin that former President Eisenhower issued two proclamations calling upon our people to support the just aspiration of the captive nations. It gives them less comfort to recall that President Kennedy has issued two such proclamations because the continuity of our Government's intent was thereby established.

The city of Buffalo, seat of my district, stands foremost among the great

cities of our country in the annual observance of Captive Nations Week. Long known as the city of good neighbors, it has now won the accolade of "city of dedicated neighbors"—dedicated to the cause of peace with justice and freedom for all nations and peoples. The spirit of the rugged frontier runs strong among the citizens of Buffalo, a city blessed with the talents of immigrants over many generations from the lands now held captive by the Russians. If Khrushchev really believes, as he states, that Americans are too liberal to fight for their rights, I urgently suggest that he tune in on the feelings of the people in Buffalo. He will get a real earful from Buffalo citizens, who are justly proud of their progressive city and equally proud of their record of sacrifice for freedom's cause.

The people of my district are rightfully concerned about the Russian occupation of Cuba, resting as it does some 90 miles off our shores. I have received appeals and petitions to seek recognition of Cuba as a captive nation and to request Congress to take action to amend Public Law 86-90 to declare Cuba a victim of Russian imperial communism. These appeals do not come from Cuban exiles, though the good people of Buffalo have provided a haven for many of those exiles. The appeals come from an alerted citizenry, disturbed by the Russian probing in our vital waters, who are concerned about the Russian military buildup in Cuba, and who are determined that the ancient dreams of Czar Nicholas I for this hemisphere shall be routed and defeated in our times.

Mr. Speaker, I have consulted with our distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee on the prospects of amending Public Law 86-90 during the present session of Congress to include Cuba as a captive nation. He has a warm understanding of my proposal, and is sympathetic to my purposes. We are in the last days of the 87th Congress, and moving rapidly toward adjournment. It is doubtful that sufficient time remains for the necessary committee hearings on my proposal to amend Public Law 86-90 to include Cuba as a captive nation. However, I am submitting my amendment to Public Law 86-90 now and will reintroduce it in the early days of the 88th Congress, when I am assured of early committee hearings on it.

I believe that Cuba qualifies by any and every fair measure of fact as a nation held captive by Russian imperialism. A Russian style government has been imposed upon the people of Cuba against their will. There have been no free elections since the Castro crowd took over. There are no individual liberties in Cuba today. Freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of opinion, of conscience, of religion—all have been throttled by Castro. The promised social reforms, the reforms demanded by justice in the social order, have been flaunted by the Castro regime. In brief, the Castro crowd has robbed the Cuban people of the just fruits of their revolution. And worse, the Castro regime has introduced the seeds of Russian aggression, war, and imperialism into the pacific life of the

Western Hemisphere. That pacific life has been the history of the Western Hemisphere, the New World—the new world of hope and promise for the suffering masses of older worlds across the seven seas. The citizens of the United States, the most blessed among the peoples of this pacific hemisphere, have a heavy responsibility in repulsing and finally defeating the Russian imperialists who offer nothing but terror, tyranny, war, and death to the peoples of the world. Our people will not shirk their responsibilities. They will do what needs to be done to recapture the peace with justice promised to the valiant during World War II, and since denied them by the ambitions of imperial Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all Members of like persuasion to join with me in my effort to amend this historic document of justice for and among all the nations of the earth.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker I commend the gentleman from New York for his stand on the Cuban crisis. I agree with him that Congress should declare Cuba to be a captive nation by amending Public Law 86-90.

It is appropriate on this occasion to recall that it was the leadership of our distinguished Speaker as sponsor of Public Law 86-90 in the 86th Congress where he served as our majority leader which brought about passage of that historic freedom declaration. There are many monuments to freedom's cause in the long and dedicated record of Speaker McCormack, but none stands higher in the acclaim of the American people than his Captive Nations Week resolution. Millions of oppressed and persecuted people behind the Russian and Bamboo Curtains were encouraged by the enactment of Public Law 86-90, their hopes for a better tomorrow were renewed. In distant lands, where the young torch of freedom is threatened by imperial Russia, our friends and allies were reassured of our determination to stand firm for the cause of justice for all nations. Among our treaty allies in ancient Europe the torch of freedom was rekindled. In Moscow the fires of war and aggression were dampened by this historic declaration. Such were the effects of Public Law 86-90.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident I speak for the membership of the House when I say a proven champion of human rights presides over this great parliamentary body.

I again compliment my friend from New York for calling upon Congress to recognize Cuba as a captive nation. I will support him in the amendment which he will offer early in the 88th Congress.

Mr. DULSKI. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

OUR OUTMODED QUOTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

out. In today's New York Herald Tribune Tom Lambert tells us how much care the doctors use on their individual patients:

OH, DOCTOR, PLEASE
(By Tom Lambert)

Britain's exasperated Medical Defense Union, which assists doctors in lawsuits, pleaded again yesterday with hospitals and doctors to halt mixups in which wrong patients are operated on—or right patients operated on for wrong ailments.

The plea seems unlikely to afford much mental comfort to Britons awaiting surgery.

The MDU said the following mixups occurred last year:

"Due to a mental aberration," a doctor who had been treating an 81-year-old woman for a fractured left femur (thigh bone) operated on her right femur.

A doctor performed a hernia operation on a 4-year-old boy who had been admitted to a hospital for removal of a cyst on his knee.

Because of a nurse's dereliction, a patient who had been taken to surgery for removal of his second left toe came out with his second right toe amputated.

An anesthetist injected a patient with surgical spirit instead of a local anesthetic.

A doctor intending to swab a man's arm with alcohol sluiced him down with formic acid.

The MDU issued a comparable "be careful" plea last year to doctors and hospitals here, noting then that a surgical mixup can be a "haunting reproach to the surgeon." The plea obviously was not heeded fully.

As it did last year, the MDU called on doctors again to visit patients in their rooms before operating on them, and called on hospitals to identify patients with discs or labels before they are wheeled into surgery.

Doctors should summon patients to the operating table by name and number, the MDU said, and not call for "the patient from such and such a ward."

Career of Director of Legal Affairs, Organization of American States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I extended my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to include an address before the Inter-American Bar Association by F. V. Garcia-Amador, Director, Department of Legal Affairs, Organization of American States. Since then I have received numerous favorable comments. In view of the interest in this distinguished gentleman, and his important role in hemispheric affairs, I know my colleagues will be interested in the following sketch of his background and of his career:

F. V. GARCIA-AMADOR

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

1. Doctor of laws and of political sciences (University of Havana).
2. Master of arts (Columbia University).
3. Master of laws (Harvard University).
4. Doctor of philosophy (Columbia University).

ACADEMIC RECORD

1. Former professor of international law of the Inter-American University (1944-46, Panama).

2. Idem of the University of Villanueva (Havana, 1956-57).

3. Idem of the University of Havana (1959-60).

4. Lecturer at the Académie de Droit International (The Hague, 1958).

5. Occasional Lectures at the Institut Universitaire de Hautes Etudes Internationales (Geneva), Escuela de Funcionarios Internacionales (Madrid), Universidad de San Marcos (Lima), etc.

6. Visiting scholar, international legal studies program, Harvard Law School (1960-61).

PUBLICATIONS

Books

"El Proceso Internacional Panamericano" (La Habana, 1943).

"La Explotación y Conservación de las Riquezas del Mar" (La Habana, 1956).

"The Exploitation and Conservation of the Resources of the Sea, a Study of Contemporary International Law" (The Hague, 1959).

"Introducción al Estudio del Derecho Internacional Contemporáneo" (Madrid, 1959).

Other publications

Reports (6) on international responsibility, in his capacity as special rapporteur of the United Nations International Law Commissions (U.N. docs., published from 1956 to 1961).

A number of articles in United States, European, and Latin American legal periodicals.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Legal Official, U.N. Secretariat (1948-49).

Member of the Inter-American Judicial Committee (Rio de Janeiro, 1949).

Member and President (1956) U.N. International Law Commission, elected by the General Assembly in 1953, and reelected in 1956, for a total period of 8 years.

Legal Counsel of the Cuban Foreign Ministry and Ambassador-at-large from 1950 to July 1960.

Deputy Representative of Cuba to the U.N. Security Council, and President of its Committee of Experts (1950).

Representative to five regular sessions of the General Assembly, and President of its Legal Committee (1954).

Delegate to the X Inter-American Conference (Caracas, 1954) and the fifth meeting of consultation of the Foreign Ministers (Santiago de Chile, 1959).

Representative to the first four meetings of the Inter-American Council of Jurists (1950 to 1959).

Delegate to the U.N. Fishery Conservation Conference (and Deputy President thereof, Rome, 1955); and to the first and second U.N. Conferences on the Law of the Sea (Geneva, 1958, and 1960, respectively).

Adviser, Department of Legal Affairs, Organization of American States (from October 1961).

Director, Department of Legal Officers, Organization of American States (from August 1, 1962).

For Cuba, Move Against Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly impressed with a timely editorial from the pen of Malcolm B. Johnson which appeared in the Tallahassee Democrat of Wednesday, September 19. I concur wholeheartedly in his position. He has suggested a course of action which should

prove much more effective than the present policy of attempting to kill the heads of the Hydra singly.

The editorial follows:

FOR CUBA, MOVE AGAINST RUSSIA

Florida's Senator GEORGE SMATHERS proposes in Senate resolutions that the United States move against Cuba by recognizing a government-in-exile dedicated to invasion and that we seek a NATO-type force among Western Hemisphere nations to help free the island from its captors.

These proposals sound sensible to us. So do many of the other suggestions made by Members of Congress in response to pleas from an angry nation discouraged by the timidity of our national administration.

But aren't such moves, directed against the Castro government and the island he occupies, merely sideshow action—necessary, but preliminary? Isn't it time for us to move into the center ring and take over?

Castro is a puppet, a yapping puppy unworthy of the indignation—much less the alarms—of Americans. The real villain is Soviet Russia. If Russia were not meddling in this situation, we Americans wouldn't care any more about which dictators controlled that island than we have cared about a hundred other little Latin American tyrants.

So let's go further than talk about blockading or invading that island, and turn our attention directly to the primary menace—Communist Russia.

There are ways to deal with Red Russia, short of shooting, that, for some elusive reason, we have not taken.

Let us treat Russia like the carrier of an evil, contagious disease she is. Shun her. Move to put her under quarantine.

From the floor of the United Nations and through the forum of the world's free press, let us scorn her. Every day, let us move against her with resolution, and with action. Every day, let us read a new indictment against her for her countless transgressions.

Stop selling her anything. Stop buying anything from her. Stop letting her people and her officials come among us to spy and to lie about us. Call on our allies and those other nations which profess love of freedom and morality to join us.

Move for her expulsion from the United Nations for numerous U.N. Charter violations and lapses of obligation. (The record is there.)

Make it known to the world, without question, that we are ready to sever all diplomatic and economic relations with Russia and her allies. Hound her out of the society of decent nations. The Communist world cannot stand such censure.

Oh, certainly, we will find timidity among our allies and the neutrals we finance in the U.N., and even in NATO.

It is far past time for us to test their professed desires for liberty and right. Let them decide whether to stand with us, or to lie down with the forces of evil, blackmail, and tyranny.

If such action results in breaking up the United Nations, so be it. We'll save money, and in the process avoid being caught in further embarrassing kangaroo court proceedings where we must humble ourselves to grovel for supporting votes of upstart pigmy nations.

Let us find out—right now, before lifting another finger for foreign aid—where our helpfulness has found grateful friendship.

The whole world knows this situation in Cuba is a test of our determination to resist the advances of communism—a clearer test of the will of the United States than Berlin, or Laos, or Korea.

Although some of our allies would desert us, others would stand; but we are strong enough to stand alone, and we could stand better without any false friends to depend on. Russia can't, yet count on such support from even her own satellites.

So let's throw down the gauntlet. Now. In Washington, and in the U.N. General Assembly meeting in New York.

No person, no nation, ever gained anything worthwhile by pussyfooting and compromising to avoid coming to grips with an evil force that constantly abused good intentions to grow stronger and bolder.

Trial of Criminal Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, recently there have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of statements by Members of the Congress concerning a pending criminal prosecution in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida in which the defendants, James R. Hoffa and Robert E. McCarthy, are charged with fraud by mail, telegraph, and telephone. I have confidence that the Federal court in Florida will set the case down for trial and will grant to the two defendants the speedy trial to which they are entitled under the sixth amendment. While I believe quite strongly that criminal cases should be tried in the courtroom, and not in the newspapers or in the Congress, the following facts concerning case No. 1282-61 Southern District of Florida, United States against Hoffa and McCarthy, seem worth setting forth.

The record will disclose that the Government first asked for a trial date under an earlier indictment in March 1961. On June 25, 1962, the defendants argued that they could not go to trial on September 10, 1962, because one of their attorneys was involved in other litigation on that date. Judge Lieb ordered the defendants to be prepared for trial on October 15, 1962.

According to record the defendants in this case have not always appeared to be as ready, willing and able to go to trial as they would now seem to want to make the people believe. Witness the fact that the defendants have filed 40 motions in the case. The defendants have filed appeals to the Supreme Court on two of these motions and the Supreme Court cannot even commence to consider these appeals until next month at the earliest.

In the most recent hearing in this case on August 20, 1962, when the matter of the trial date was discussed, there was read into the record an affidavit from the personal physician of the defendant McCarthy which read in part as follows:

Mr. McCarthy has " * * * a grave condition in any instance (which) by extension can be fatal. In fact, it very often is. I have continued to treat Mr. McCarthy for this condition to date * * * exposure to any excitement or unusual situations would only serve to worsen Mr. McCarthy's prognosis. Assuming that Mr. McCarthy was exposed to a trial of any protracted length involving signal intensity at this time or any time

within the next 120 days, it is my professional opinion that such an ordeal would involve a serious sequel to his immediate condition which might well result in total future incapacitation or a fatality.

It would appear from this evidence that defendant McCarthy could not have gone to trial at the date suggested by defense counsel. This is, however, a matter which the court should decide and a matter which the court did decide.

The real basis for the court's decision not to try this case on the date previously set, October 15, 1962, appears to lie neither with the defendants or the Government but rather with an action taken by Congress. It is for this reason that I as a member of the Judiciary Committee of this House, which considered the legislation involved feel obliged to set the record straight.

On July 30, 1962, Public Law 87-562 became law. It created a new middle judicial district in Florida, which had previously been divided into a northern and a southern district. The new district will come into existence on October 28. The case of United States against Hoffa and McCarthy is now in the Tampa division of the southern district, to which it had been removed by order of court. At the present time the Tampa division is in the southern district, but after October 28, some of its counties will be in the new middle district, and others will remain in the southern district.

The new middle district of Florida will be the first new judicial district created by the Congress in 35 years. Its creation will bring to the courts a number of problems of transition, including the question of what should be done with untried cases and cases which might, if started before October 28, not be completed by the date that the new district is created.

The judges of the southern district met concerning these problems, and determined as a matter of judicial administration that southern district cases which fall in the new district should be re-calendarated in the new district October 29 if their trial could not be completed prior to that date. This was in my opinion a wise decision, avoiding the possibility that doubts might be cast on the validity of convictions in cases where the trial was started in one district and completed in another. U.S. against Hoffa and McCarthy was but one of a number of cases which were affected by this decision.

Too Partisan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ryan Leader of September 20, 1962, by Editor J. T. Daniel, concerning the partisan cries on Communist Cuba:

TOO PARTISAN

(By J. T. Daniel)

When wars were of the conventional type, rifles, cannons, tanks, airplanes, and other weapons of destruction, they were terrifying. But in this day of missiles, atom and hydrogen bombs, they are horrible and annihilating.

This being true, it would seem that men of any sense of responsibility for the safety of their own lives and those of their countrymen would at least try to refrain from inflaming the minds of the people.

The United States of America is a democracy. And a democracy is much different to a dictatorship. In a democracy, its rulers must listen to the voice of the people, or they will be defeated at the next election. This is not true in a dictatorship. A dictator is not subject to the whims of pleasure groups. Public sentiment is not so important in a dictatorship. Khrushchev can rave and rant all he pleases without building a war sentiment that will force him to start to shooting. In the United States this is different.

The people of the United States are rather susceptible to warlike propaganda. And when politicians and others try to inflame public sentiment here about Russia's disregard for the Monroe Doctrine, they should be honest and tell the American people that the Truman doctrine of 1947 actually supplanted the Monroe Doctrine. If it hadn't, we would not have our guns pointed at Khrushchev's head in all the countries of Europe surrounding him. The Monroe Doctrine prohibited this.

If people are given the facts they will not become the victims of a war frenzy that will force a big war. Heedlessly, recklessly, and wantonly some men seem to be so obsessed by a desire for partisan gain they would risk blowing themselves, the American people, Cuba, and the Russians off the face of the earth, just to try to make votes.

It is time the American people woke up to the dangers of such a course of action. They should tell the hotheads in and out of Congress to keep their big mouths shut. It is no time to become spooky and do something foolish because a bewhiskered adde-pated Cuban mouse happens to take a wild run across the international stage.

A Tribute to County ASC Committeemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, last week this body approved the farm bill as reported by the conferees. We believe this bill will do much toward solving our farm problems, but I had hoped that we could have passed long-term legislation which would have been effective for 1963 and thereafter, and would have given farmers more time to make plans.

In an effort to ascertain what farmers wanted in the way of farm legislation, if any, we conducted a poll earlier in the year. The response, in our opinion, was excellent for out of 25,000 questionnaires mailed out, we received back about one-fourth completed returns. We will have to say though, we were greatly surprised at the many varied opinions as to what

farm legislation should or should not accomplish. The majority of those who completed the questionnaires, favored some type of farm program, and each of us know that even if a program were excellent in every particular, if there is no one to carry out the program, it would be worthless, or of very little value.

One of the questions asked on this survey was, "Do you favor farmer-elected committees as the best means of administering farm programs on the local level?" After compilation had been made of the returned completed questionnaires, we found that 84.3 farmers favored the county elected committees, 9 percent did not, and 6.7 percent had no opinion.

Today, I rise to pay tribute to these dedicated men who give of their time and energy in behalf of their neighbors and indirectly to the Nation as a whole. Those consecrated men in the Fourth Missouri District, are chosen by their fellow farmers to make the necessary decisions, to explain and to generally supervise the administration of the farm programs at the county level.

Our country is blessed with an overabundance, and each of us should give thanks each night before we close our eyes that we live in America where overabundance and not starvation is one of our major problems. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, regardless of what kind of farm program is finally adopted, it will not work—it cannot succeed, unless we encourage our farmers to supervise themselves to administer these farm programs by those chosen from their own ranks.

I am a firm believer that the family farm is the great symbol of freedom and free enterprise. And I believe that we owe the family farm a great debt of gratitude for its contribution to our American heritage. In our deliberation I say again, I hope we will not forget the people, the individuals, the folks who carry out or administer our farm programs on the county level. It is a privilege to salute you, our county ASC committeemen, dedicated to the cause of better farming, and devoted in your efforts for the improvement of farm income and the contentment of our people who would perpetuate the family farm.

Cuba Lifeline Can Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the recent action by the Government of West Germany in restricting German-flag ships from taking part in the Cuban Russian buildup deserves the praise of all of us who have been seeking the halt to such activities by our friends in the free world.

Now that West Germany has led the way, it is hoped that all others who have been involved in this traffic will follow with like action.

Victor Riesel is one of those who can justly take credit for this first break in the Cuban supply line. His disclosures of those involved have been fully documented with the names of ships and their flags. He has pointed out time and again that this trade could be stopped, if we would insist that it be stopped. When action was not forthcoming he pointed out the facts for the American public.

In a recent article, Mr. Riesel points out that some shipping firms are making millions of dollars from the United States by carrying American cargo across the world; and yet these same ships not only supply Cuba but Communist China as well.

Thus, not only do the foreign vessels strengthen our enemies, but they weaken the United States by depriving our seamen of jobs and our shipping firms of profits, as Mr. Riesel points out.

Because of the importance of the information contained in this article, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

CUBA LIFELINE CAN BE CUT

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK.—Cuba's waterborne supply lines can be cracked with the stroke of a pen.

What's needed is a Presidential directive shutting U.S. ports to vessels and ship-charters companies which deal with the enemy. This means a blacklist. Why not?

There are many foreign firms now making millions of dollars from the U.S. Government itself by carrying heavy tonnage of Federal cargo across the world. And yet these same ships—lists of which any Federal agency can get along this waterfront—not only supply Cuba, but Communist China, Russia, Poland, and even weird Albania. This the foreign-flag ships often embark on immediately after delivering American cargo abroad.

Thus, not only do the foreign vessels strengthen our enemies, but they weaken the United States by depriving our seamen of jobs and our shipping firms of profits.

Tankers of our NATO Allies, for example, have been running Soviet oil to Cuba for many, many months now—long before the Soviet landings on the island needed some of us into an outcry over the current merchant fleet supplied to the Soviet bloc by nations to which we have been giving billions of dollars.

Those tankers are chartered by the Russians because the Soviet ministry of the maritime fleet is short of these big floating fuel tanks. The tankers, owned by Greek and British firms, or by complex companies operating under Panamanian, Liberian, and Honduran flags, first deliver the Russian oil to Havana. Then the empty tankers put into U.S. ports for profitable cargoes.

This may be cut down some day. The Soviets have just completed the *Bucharest*. This is the fifth in a series of huge tankers which they call "Peking-type vessels." They have been built in the Leningrad "Baltic shipyards." So desperately does Cuba need this fuel that it has become traditional for the Soviet ministry to put its new tankers immediately into the Cuban run. But still there are not enough. Yet ships of our "friends" continue to help them.

And then there are the ship operators who get business from the American Government because of our efforts to feed a hungry non-

Communist world. There is a Federal directive which states that only 50 percent of our shipments of surplus foods to needy nations must be shipped in U.S. "bottoms." So, to lend a hand and a dollar to freighters of friendly nations, we give them the cargo job.

Many of these foreign-flag ships carry grain to the Orient. Sometimes to India. Sometimes to Africa or the Near East. Then they steam into the China Sea and the Pacific. There they shuttle back and forth for the Peiping Communist Government. In Hong Kong recently I talked to masters and mates of such ships.

They disclosed that after handling some of the "Chi-com" business they heave back to Europe's Communist bloc ports. There they load up with heavy cargoes for Cuba. Of course, they carry armaments. But almost as vital are the vast quantities of prefabricated factories and plants, machine tools, spare parts, steel mill sections, and electronic equipment.

These will create a Soviet-type industrial system in Cuba. In a few years it will begin producing for export to the South American market—thereby undermining local producers and therefore chances for recovery amongst our Alliance for Progress allies.

After the NATO nation ships unload in Cuban ports they have only one chance for a new payload there. That is sugar. But sabotage and sheer inefficiency have slashed the harvesting of this crop. So there is only enough for part of the chartered supply fleet. The ones who get the loads then steam to Russia and Poland or through the Panama Canal to China. But all the other vessels face going back light.

Thus many of them, after dropping their Red cargoes in Cuba, head for the United States to make certain they can pick up a paying shipment and thus make a profit from both sides.

There are waterfront union leaders here who say they have evidence that the Yugoslav merchant fleet is running cargo for the Communist bloc. This cargo, they say, is mostly military. It comes from the Czech munition-making complex built around the famed Skoda works. Waterfront experts here report that Yugoslav ships regularly put into Havana.

Furthermore, the union leaders assert bluntly—sometimes in anger fully peppered with sailor's language—that the State Department has all this information. And that it has had it for some time.

Why then does everybody in official circles seem so surprised these days?

Why not blacklist those ships which make a dollar out of trading with enemies who already are shooting at American soldiers, sailors and airmen? Why not?

Senator Johnston Merits Reelection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very fine editorial from the *Winnboro, S.C., News & Herald* of Thursday, September 20, 1962, which I commend to every citizen of my State who is interested in the continuation of good government.

The article is as follows:

SENATOR JOHNSTON MERITS RELECTION

Bill Workman is among the finest journalists one could meet in a day's journey between sunrise and sunset on the 21st of June. He is a gentleman, a scholar, an author, and—to his credit—he is probably not a judge of good whiskey because, like his opponent, he is a teetotaler.

The News & Herald wishes him exceedingly well in every respect save one: we want him to remain in the newspaper fraternity and serve his people there—not in the U.S. Senate, from a standing start. The ink looks good on his fingers and, as he will probably recall, his onetime chief, the late Dr. W. W. Ball, longtime editor of the Charleston News & Courier, avowed that newsmen had no business running for public office, because, for one thing, they sacrifice their objectivity. And, in Dr. Ball's lexicon, there was no higher profession than that of a journalist.

Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, in our opinion, has earned the right to reelection to a fourth term. His 18 years' experience is an asset to the people of South Carolina and will become increasingly so during the next 6. Patently, the Republican press in Columbia is missing no trick, either in news or editorial columns or in cartoons, in a determined effort to see that Senator JOHNSTON is defeated, but, we believe, this is another case of a lost cause. Characteristically, the Columbia Record, in one of its too, too clever cartoons titled "The Little People's Coloring Book," compares the Palmetto State's senior Senator to "Captain Kangaroo," disparages his ability, acumen, decorum and voting record in this and other extreme ways. Ofttimes, however, he who laughs last, laughs longest, and our inept guess is that these self-styled big journals may find that much-maligned OLIN is, after all, "the little people's man," come election day.

One concedes that Senator JOHNSTON is no silver-tongued orator, the likes of William Jennings Bryan, and he is not a Woodrow Wilson-type scholar and grammarian, either. But, since when has this become a political crime? Not one in a million of us have such attributes and few people can aspire to be as literate as those masters of the "big word"—when a little one would serve 'em better—who write for the GOP press in South Carolina. On occasions too numerous to catalog, these papers delight in downgrading both President and Senator, when it suits their political propaganda purposes.

Neither is Senator JOHNSTON the ultraliberal that his enemies try to paint him. Often he worked and voted against excessive spending and waste in foreign and domestic programs; he is, perhaps, ultraconservative on the race question, but his views here probably reflect those of a majority of his constituents. If he can be accurately tagged a "liberal" or "progressive" in any field—and such labels really have little meaning—it is in his votes and views on labor legislation and, from our vantage point in a minor managerial post, we cannot conscientiously say he is wrong. Labor, in South Carolina and in other parts of the Nation, has not precisely been living high on the hog of late—due to considerable unemployment and part-time jobs—and if labor has a moderate friend in Washington who is aware of its needs, who can raise legitimate objection? Senator JOHNSTON, in our view, is not radical even in the labor field and he kowtows to no overbearing, unscrupulous labor bosses.

It is, of course, understandable that the rank and file likes the senior Senator and the stands he takes because he came up through the ranks, himself. He worked in the mills to earn money for his education.

House Resolution 211: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286 to 3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CLARINDA, IOWA,
August 24, 1962.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned members of We the People Study Group acknowledge our support of House Resolution 211 for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. We feel that exposure to the world of the captive nations situation constitutes a great potential weapon against the Communist conspiracy. We therefore urge you to do all in your power to activate this bill now before the House Rules Committee and to effect its adoption by the Congress.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Harold Witthoft, Mrs. Martin Mier, Una Cole, Mrs. Ross Miller, Clarinda, Iowa; Mrs. John Bicknese, Wheatland, Iowa; Mrs. Jessie P. Shambaugh, Mrs. Harb J. Sunderman, Herb J. Sunderman, Harold Witthoft, Mrs. Floyd Wagoner, Floyd Wagoner, Laura Edmonds, Mr. and Mrs. T. E. Stickelman, Mr. and Mrs. Darrell Damewood, Mr. and Mrs. Jake Stimson, Clarinda, Iowa.

AUGUST 28, 1962.

DEAR FRIEND OF LITHUANIA: Congratulations on your efforts for Lithuania and the

other captive, colonial nations of the U.S.S.R. Let us hope that free elections can be held there someday.

Sincerely,

A. D. YUKNIS.

NORTHBROOK, ILL.,
August 27, 1962.

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: Thank you for so clearly pointing out, in your speech of August 8, the startling contrast between President Kennedy's proclamation of Captive Nations Week 1962, and the congressional resolution of 1959.

For some time I have been following the attempts to establish a House Committee on Captive Nations. This would provide a sorely needed encouragement to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, as well as putting their slavemasters on notice that we have not abandoned these peoples to perpetual slavery. And yet the attitude of Secretary of State Rusk and the State Department is that we must not do anything which might antagonize the Communists. This same thinking has motivated the President's weak Captive Nations Week declaration.

I am thankful that we have men such as yourself in the Senate, who realize the folly of trying to be nice to the Communists.

Sincerely,

Mrs. STEPHEN KRAYCHY.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: Please keep up the fight for a Captive Nations Committee.

MARY M. KRAYCHY.

BREMERTON CAPTIVE NATIONS COUNCIL,
Bremerton, Wash., September 3, 1962.

Re Report of 1962 activities in relation to Captive Nations Week and House Resolution 211.

1. Lectured in Seattle, Bellingham, and Tacoma on the captive nations concept and the working procedures of a captive nations organization, providing guidelines for operational methods and activities.

2. At the Kitsap County Republican Central Committee Convention, we proposed, from the floor, a plank stipulating support of the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations as set forth in House Resolution 211, now pending in the U.S. House of Representatives. The proposed plank was debated and adopted.

3. Participated in the public meeting at the Seattle Chamber of Commerce building on Monday of Captive Nations Week, at which time we presented and read the annual proclamation by the Honorable H. O. Domstad, mayor of the city of Bremerton.

4. Printed and distributed 10,000 copies of a document entitled "The Third Week in July." This paper included the text of Public Law 86-90, President Eisenhower's 1959 Captive Nations Week proclamation, and President Kennedy's 1961 proclamation.

5. At the request of the Washington State Republican Central Committee Convention, we supplied 50 copies of a statement explaining the proposed establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations, a sheet setting forth the elements and extent of support for this legislation, and copies of "The Third Week in July." (The plank, identical to that adopted in Kitsap County, passed through the platform committee without debate; and was adopted by the convention, again without debate.)

6. At our suggestion, the Bremerton Chamber of Commerce studied the question of the proposed bill, House Resolution 211, and as a result of this inquiry into the matter, did pass and forward to Representative Flood a resolution in support of the House

directly finance the aid program for this year if other means fail.

The debate brought out some very potent specific points on foreign aid which should be considered by every American citizen. We are now giving foreign aid to 101 of the 113 nations of the world. Furthermore, by special permission, we have started aid programs in practically every British possession and territory in the world. The aid programs are not limited to so-called free nations. We are pouring the American taxpayers' wealth into dictatorships, so-called neutral nations, Communist-influenced and Communist-dominated nations, and into outright Communist countries. We have been giving our wealth and earnings for years to people who tax themselves not at all, or at least at far lower rates than we. And many of these nations which not only accept our gifts, but demand more, are no nearer now to self-support than when we started to pay their bills. Foreign aid money is handled so loosely that if we were to use the same procedure in financing domestic programs such as public works, the people would rise in wrath to ridicule the authors of such proposals. Agency witnesses before the Appropriations Committee said they do not know the projects to which they are going to obligate funds until after they get the money. One witness said in fact that the United States kept these matters secret from the recipient countries until after the money had been made available. Fantastic as this sounds it is true.

The military phase of the foreign aid program is not military in the sense that we think of our own Defense Establishment. What it is, primarily, is a State Department military program through which military equipment is being provided to from 65 to 71 nations of the world; and much of it is given to please or appease some potentate, or some ruler of a newly created country. In some cases this is causing resentment such as Thailand's protest against our supplying fighter planes to Cambodia. Another project in this category is the donation of a newly rebuilt air-conditioned yacht for the private use of Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia with staterooms covered with gold-leaf wallpaper. The reconditioning of the airplane tender cost \$3,100,000.

The balance-of-payments problem and the outflow of gold is also the direct result of foreign aid. The drain on our gold reserves, much of it through outright purchase of gold with our dollars by foreign nations which have received our aid, is excessive. During the last 11 years the net outflow of gold from the U.S. Treasury has amounted to over \$6,305 million. Our gold holdings are currently just above \$16 billion. During the same 11 years in which we lost gold, other free world countries increased their holdings by \$10,655 million, to just under \$24 billion. We require \$11.6 billion as gold backing for our domestic dollars by law. We have, therefore, scarcely \$5 billion in gold to meet our international obligations and our free world friends now hold short-term dollar assets just under \$23 billion redeemable in our gold. In spite of the fact that the executive branch is not able to spend all the money appropriated they have asked for an increase in this year's foreign-aid appropriation. In last year's session of Congress an appropriation of \$3.9 billion was approved. The administration was only able to spend \$3,198,100,000. Congress appropriated \$716,500,000 more than was spent and this amount was transferred to the pipeline. There is enough money now in the pipeline, already appropriated by previous Congresses to continue the foreign-aid program for 25 months without a cent of additional appropriations.

Direct quotes from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD point up the dismal failures of our foreign aid programs and the increasing

danger they impose upon us. "The country cannot go along in this fashion and survive. Our national debt in the last 12 months increased by \$8 billion. Our governmental expenditures in the last 2 months, the first 2 of this fiscal year, increased by \$2 billion," Congressman TABER, of New York. "Cambodia recently bought \$3.1 million of our gold; Lebanon purchased \$21 million of our gold; Nigeria bought \$20 million; Saudi Arabia, \$47 million, and Spain \$156.2 million. These transactions neither enhance our gold reserve situation nor improve the living conditions in those countries," Congressman HARSHA, of Ohio. (They buy our gold with dollars we give them.) "The gentleman referred to the purchase of television sets for Africa. There were 1,000 23-inch transistorized battery-operated television sets purchased at a cost of \$400,000. It was proposed to use them in areas where there is no electrical power supply. So how did they propose to charge the batteries? They were going to charge them with a hand crank, or they were going to get a merry-go-round and charge the batteries by the merry-go-round's operation. The batteries would be charged while the children were playing on the merry-go-round. But in case they did not have a merry-go-round they were going to get one of these squirrel cages, a treadmill affair where the squirrel runs around, to charge the battery while he was running around getting nowhere." Congressman MEADER, of Michigan. "I am convinced that we are being widely oversold as to the prospective results to be obtained from our generous intervention. We give food, fuel, fertilizer, seeds, clothing, raw materials, machinery, development grants and loans, technical services, military hardware, and now even the Peace Corps. Are all these things actually bringing old and the newly emerging nations into our camp to offset the encroachments of communism? I think it is obvious that they are not. Or, do many of them accept our aid on the one hand and then look in the other direction to see what Russia can do for them?" Congressman PASSMAN, of Louisiana. "With this country having a debt of \$301 billion, with the interest on that debt desperately close to \$10 billion a year, with this country's public and private debts totaling nearly \$1.1 trillion, Congress ought to regain its senses and put a stop to these lavish giveaways. * * * I was astounded by the fact that were produced by the committee * * * this Government is spending \$6,000 a year on Iraqi students in this country each school year, \$6,000 plus a year. * * * I doubt if there are very many Members of the House of Representatives who can afford to spend \$6,000 a year on each of his or her children in a university or college in this country," Congressman GROSS, of Iowa.

How does the Kennedy administration get approval for its foreign aid program? Look at the RECORD (p. 19031, Sept. 20, 1962) citing the "seven-point formula used by 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue" to get its program through. "That formula is comprised of the application of prestige, personality, propaganda, persuasion, power, pressure, and maybe, punishment."

In summary the foreign aid program is not in the self-interest of the United States. It drains our wealth, depletes our gold supply, fails to help the people in the countries receiving it, in many cases it actually goes to our enemies and strengthens those governments which have vowed to destroy us, it does not win friends but instead creates ill-will, jealousy and envy, creates unfair competition for American business contributing to loss of jobs by American workers, it is mismanaged, it is reckless, it has led to outright waste and in some cases dishonesty in handling money belonging to the American taxpayers. The least we can do and should do, and I have so urged for the 8 years I

have been in Congress, is to stop appropriating any more foreign aid funds until we have had an opportunity to restudy the whole program and to determine where our money should be spent in our own interest, and to develop adequate guidelines for protecting the American taxpayers from being gouged further of their hard-earned tax dollars.

Our Further Retreat in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the President is resigned to doing nothing but watching in Cuba.

Several disturbing observations have been made on the subject, including that of Ted Lewis in the New York Daily News of September 21, and David Lawrence and Marguerite Higgins in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, September 21, 1962]

CAPITAL CIRCUS

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, September 20.—A most disturbing aspect of the Cuban crisis was revealed today. It was simply to the effect that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and presumably President Kennedy and the military, are not getting the information they want about conditions inside Cuba.

This alarming fact comes from Rusk himself in an otherwise well-expurgated transcript of his closed-door testimony last Monday before the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees.

The disclosure is astounding. One of the chief lessons which should have been learned from the Bay of Pigs fiasco 17 months ago was that our intelligence reports on the Cuban internal situation were lousy.

It had been presumed then that Kennedy, burned up about the advice he had received before the abortive invasion, had his mind set on clearing up the intelligence mess.

He did name a special committee, including his brother, Robert, the Attorney General, and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, to find out what was wrong in the CIA and come up with a revamping program. This was followed up by naming John McCone, a man of great administrative ability, as CIA Chief to succeed Allen Dulles.

These actions, plus a few changes in top CIA personnel, including the resignation of Richard M. Bissell, were supposed to straighten out the intelligence mess. No longer would the President get stuff from the cloak-and-dagger boys that was unreliable. No longer would our spies in Red Cuba talk to the wrong people and pass back to Washington a prejudiced report—as before the Bay of Pigs—about how the people were ready to explode in revolt once their exiled brothers were on an invasion beachhead.

Well, it is now 17 months later, and here is what two top Cuba policymakers, Rusk and McGeorge Bundy, the President's foreign affairs adviser, have to say under questioning by Chairman RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, of the Senate Armed Service Committee.

HOW CAN WE BE SURE? THE SENATOR WANTS TO KNOW

RUSSELL (questioning Rusk). "What do you think about the quality of the information we have about what is really taking

A7066

place inside Cuba? We have been deceived in that area before. We were before the invasion, and I just wondered if we have improved our means of getting our information in Cuba on which we could rest the security of this country."

Rusk (after saying he believed we had good information on Soviet missile sites). "In terms of political information, we do need to get more than we do. We do not have as much information as we should like about the political attitudes and the effect upon the Cuban people of the stringencies which they have been facing in the last several months and to an increasing degree."

RUSSELL (now questioning Bundy). "How can we determine what he (a Soviet specialist) is doing? We get such scanty information over here, how can we tell whether he is teaching them to build a powerline or whether he is teaching them to engage a radar set so as to fire missiles against the United States?"

IT'S ENOUGH TO GIVE AN AMERICAN THE REAL SHIVERS

BUNDY. "I don't think we can be sure of that, Senator."

RUSSELL. "Is there any truth in the news stories that these people (the Russians) live in colonies?"

BUNDY. "Yes, sir. I think they do, sir."

Rusk. "That has been a pretty general pattern throughout the world, particularly when they are in substantial numbers."

The Rusk and Bundy responses should scare the daylight out of some of us peasants, at least. They aren't even positive that the Russians are living in guarded enclaves. Rusk isn't even sure whether or not Khrushchev's technicians are teaching the Castroites how to shoot missiles at the United States.

But Rusk is most sure about one thing—he is not getting hard intelligence guidance about how the Cuban masses feel about their furry fuehrer, Castro. And until this information is supplied on a solid basis, how do you launch another invasion of exiles? Or more important, how do you plan our own invasion without a clear idea of whether the peasants will embrace you or knife you?

Ten miles from the White House, on a wooded hill overlooking the Potomac, is the home base of all our spies, master and otherwise. In this \$50 million structure, well guarded with barbed wire from curious Americans, the ways and means of surreptitiously spending \$700 million annually of taxpayer funds around the world are decided on. But where is the money going as pertains to Cuba?

OUR SPIES WERE TOO HOITY-TOITY TO TALK TO PEASANTS

Here is a two-bit island, 90 miles from Key West, now fast becoming a fortress citadel of Moscow. It has a shoreline 2,175 miles long with thousands of uninhabited inlets where any one of our highly paid CIA agents, if he could swim, could clamber safely ashore every night in the week. It has a population of 6,750,000 scattered over 44,206 square miles—an area and population about that of Florida.

And yet, 17 months after the Bay of Pigs, our CIA intelligence about what is going on under Castro leaves much to be desired.

Can't any secret agents talk Spanish like native Cubans? Just what is the matter? One guess is as good as another, but it could be that our Cuban operatives are the same old bunch that messed up the Bay of Pigs. And what was really the matter with them then, including our hired operatives among the exiles? They were class conscious. They talked to the wrong people in Cuba, the rich or white-collar workers, not the peasants with dirt in their fingernails.

While Senator RUSSELL and other commitmen were clearly upset about this CIA situation, they were generally satisfied with Rusk's estimate of the reliability of our intelligence concerning Russian arms shipment and missile sites.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Sept. 24, 1962]

ON SOVIET GRAB IN CUBA: WHY DOESN'T UNITED STATES SPEAK UP?
(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Time was when a President of the United States didn't hesitate to speak forthrightly and to act in support of the principles of human freedom anywhere in the world. Two Presidents, both Democrats—Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt—led the American people as they made sacrifices for that same basic principle in two world wars.

But today there is a strange silence—even a fear that it is indiscreet or that it's loose talk to urge that America speak and act in behalf of human beings in Cuba or against the cruelty of their oppressors or against the autocratic government in Moscow which is giving military assistance to a tyrannical dictatorship in Havana.

The latest excuse or alibi now given wide currency by advisers of President Kennedy—and fed out to the press here—is that the Monroe Doctrine has been repealed because America entered World War I and World War II. It is averred that the United States, by militarily assisting certain governments in Europe and Asia during the cold war, has forfeited her right to act in behalf of peoples in this hemisphere who have had their freedoms taken from them by Communist imperialism.

If this concept gains strength, it cannot but encourage the Soviets to penetrate with impunity North and South America as well as every other continent. For, in effect, the advocates of this philosophy are saying that this country has not right to interfere with Soviet conquest of Cuba because the United States now has, under the North Atlantic Treaty, military bases in various European countries. This can only mean that America must, therefore, recognize the Soviet occupation not only of Cuba but of the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Can the Soviets point to a single example of the grant of American military aid that has resulted in any political control by the United States?

RETREAT IN EXPEDIENCY

The whole thing is an illustration of how expediency leads to one retreat after another. For the United States has just announced, through White House and State Department pronouncements, that America's Armed Forces will be used only to repel military attacks on this country or its neighbors. This is a doctrine of isolation reminiscent of the days when prominent Republicans opposed American entry into either of the two World Wars on the grounds that the interests of this country were not directly affected. It was of course, just a means of appealing to pacifistic sentiment.

Twice the dictatorship government in Berlin misconstrued this attitude as an unwillingness on the part of the United States to fight. In the end, the deliberate attack on American rights on the high seas forced this country into World War I in 1917. While it was Japan and not Germany that attacked Pearl Harbor in 1941, the United States accepted the challenge as a direct attack by the Nazi regime as well. Indeed, the United States made its main war effort on the Continent of Europe and in north Africa.

Thus, the United States in two World Wars has refused to narrow the concept of its participation in world affairs to either the

Western or Eastern Hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine has not been narrowed. It has been broadened. From 1945 until a few weeks ago, American policy has been worldwide and has been based on the principle that every people has a right to self-determination and that it is the duty of the United States to help rid the world of any sinister force that now may invade only smaller countries but in the end will invade the larger ones as well. Woodrow Wilson said to Congress in 1917 that "the world must be made safe for democracy." It is not safe today for any free government.

SILENCE MISCONSTRUED

The Soviets are talking loud because they think they can bluff America into inaction and silence. Foreign Minister Gromyko's brazen speech at the United Nations a few days ago, charging this country with aggression, is an example of how readily American silence can be misinterpreted. If the U.S. Government continues to make excuses for abandoning the people in a little country 90 miles away, how can it ever be expected either to lift its voice or render any aid to the peoples of the captive countries in Europe and Asia? To draw back into Fortress America and contend that the United States has no obligation to speak out or act in behalf of the Cuban people because this might offend Soviet Russia means that a bigger test under even more dangerous circumstances may come later on at a time when it will be more difficult, more hazardous, and more costly in human lives than it is now.

Today the vocal chords of the U.S. Government have been silenced by a strategy of fear, of hesitancy, and of vacillation, which keeps on emphasizing the totality of the world situation—as if this means that the principles of democracy and the aspirations of peoples at present under the yoke of Communist imperialism have become secondary. Yet this Nation could mobilize—by exhortation of foreign peoples—forces that would inevitably thwart the aims of the aggressors.

War or the threat of war isn't the most powerful weapon in the world today. Moral force plus economic force are even more powerful. But if there is fear even to speak, then, in the end, war comes because the enemy misinterprets silence for timidity and inaction for weakness.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Sept. 24, 1962]

THE NEW REALISM

(By Marguerite Higgins)

UNITED NATIONS.—Said the African diplomat: "Berlin? Cuba? That's not our worry. They are really the white man's burden—so to speak."

Said the Latin American: "If the United States were to do something effective to checkmate Soviet intervention in Cuba, my government would congratulate you privately and lacerate you publicly."

Now these quotations, noted on a visit to the United Nations, are not offered in any pretense that they are a scientific sampling of opinion. Still they do not deviate from roughly similar sentiments expressed along "Embassy Row" in Washington. Therefore, even as a random sampling they raise some interesting questions about the "new realism" in American foreign policy that Chester Bowles, apparently speaking, for once, with White House blessing, has expounded in a recent speech denouncing those who wish to do something about Cuba.

According to Mr. Bowles, the doctrine of the new realism is founded on the contention that if America did something about Cuba it would "undercut our influence in world affairs, blacken our reputation in the United Nations, forfeit our traditional claim to moral leadership . . . set the stage for sweeping Soviet victories in the critically

important fields of diplomacy and politics * * * and a lessening of our influence in world affairs."

If this truly represents the New Frontier's assumptions, then the question needs urgently to be put whether unwillingness to apply American power effectively in Cuba and elsewhere does, in fact save us from the dire consequences outlined by Mr. Bowles. To put it another way, Does inaction, as per the new realism, heighten our influence in world affairs, whiten our reputation in the United Nations, and enhance our traditional claim to moral leadership?

Since the New Frontier has taken to labeling its critics in foreign affairs as rash, hotheaded, and trigger-happy, it would seem appropriate, for the purposes of perspective, to introduce some views on the uses of American power of a diplomat who has never been known to be anything but calm, cool—and even pragmatic. He is the former Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy who, in a hitherto unpublished commencement address at Boston University, made a report on a visit to Latin America during and after the abortive invasion of the Bay of Pigs.

Said Mr. Murphy: "I was in Brazil at the time of the Cuban operation. I was a bit startled to be told that the reason the United States failed to intervene openly in Cuba was because our Government feared it would provoke war between the United Socialist Soviet Russia and the United States. I found little or no recognition of the consistent effort our Government has loyally made through the years to adhere to a policy of nonintervention."

So, if Mr. Murphy is a good reporter, the U.S. unwillingness to use its power got the worst of all possible verdicts: our moral leadership, far from being enhanced, yielded to the suspicion that we were merely motivated by fear of Russia.

Mr. Murphy based his views on the uses of American power on these observations: "We must take at face value the threats of world conquest * * *. We are faced with a continuing situation of probe and thrust and the most facile and articulate bourgeois negotiators the West can produce will be unable to deter the Sino-Soviet leadership from this line. So where is our refuge? I can only suggest power and more, especially American determination to use power intelligently and, if necessary, ruthlessly."

"One of the principles to which we have been firmly attached is the collective approach to international questions," Mr. Murphy continued, "But again I feel that we have gone too far in our pursuit of a basically sound idea in resorting to the collective approach indiscriminately. There are situations, for example, where we are too ready and eager to merge our national identity in the United Nations. At times I believe we do this because of reluctance to face up to a risk on our own national account. Leaning on a collectivity that includes many weak, inexperienced and frankly selfish nations leads us into situations where we are reduced to the lowest common denominator * * *. Therefore we have no alternative to asserting our independent national will and judgment, letting our associates as well as our opponents know that on issues involving our fundamental national security we are capable of going our own way."

Thus, according to the old realism of Mr. Murphy, the United States of America, which holds in its own destiny the decline or survival of freedom in our time, should not be deterred from doing anything necessary to that survival, because other nations refuse to hold its hand.

The Ink Was Badly Faded but the Message Was Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Yorkville Enquirer, York, S.C., of September 20, 1962:

THE INK WAS BADLY FADED BUT THE MESSAGE WAS CLEAR

(By Chuck DeLoach)

(About as apt as anybody could put it, one American, who admits he is sick, recently described how he—and many like him—are bringing on the downfall of this once great Nation. For some time, he sat in his home in San Francisco, read his newspaper, listened to the news over the radio and television, quietly. Inside, however, he felt a gnawing, a burning. Finally, of a day, he seized upon pen and paper and scribbled a letter to the Copley newspapers. What he had to say was soon picked up for editorials by other newspapers around the country, including the Columbia Record and the Greenville News. His letter is must reading for this Nation's "sick".)

I am one of the Americans who heard Mr. Khrushchev tell our Nation that my great-grandchildren will grow up in a Communist world. For some time now that has bothered me. I am not a brave man—not even a big one.

I suppose I would have to admit that I am, among my own neighbors and in my own culture, the typical, average, well-educated, genteel, suburbanite to whom family, the mortgage, and security have been the all-important items.

I am now 50, and soon my wife and I will see the first of our three children married. I paint my own house, repair my own car, grub my own devil grass, and nurse a modest savings account at the Bank of America. I am a law-abiding man on the quiet side, and dissension makes me terrible nervous. Frankly, I am the kind who simply doesn't have it in him to fight anyone ever.

My wife had me cleaning out an old trunk in the storage room the other day, and I ran across the huge old family Bible that I had not thought about for years. My great-grandmother had kept a journal of the trip across the Great Plains with a wagon, and oxen when she and great-grandpa were youngsters coming out to settle in California in the great migration. Great-grandma wrote about it as the wild, new land, rich and abundant in mythical proportions.

On the trail she wrote of sickness and hunger, and heat and cold, and dust and thirst, and the deaths and births like beads strung together on a thread of hope of freedom and a land of plenty for their children yet unborn. And when she viewed the new land she wrote in simple word pictures of the cities and farms and schools, and happiness that would some day bloom in the greatness of the vast new land. She wrote of her tomorrow and my today.

The ink was badly faded, but the message was clear. As I read, I began to think about America and being an American and what it all stands for; and I thought about our enemies and what they intend to do to Amer-

ica, to those rich lands and farms, to the cities and the people, to its freedom and its hope.

And, suddenly, I realized that I am a sick American. I mean really sick. I am sick of panaceas and of backing up. I am sick of reactions where there should be initiative. I am sick of bureaucrats who tell me that my enemy is not really my enemy, and that I should live together with murderers and tyrants.

I am sick of government that hasn't the guts to clean traitors out of its own offices. And I'm sick of being a nice, patient guy about it. I am sick of placidly accepting excuses instead of successes; of being a silent gentleman for fear of controversy. I am sick of my country being ridiculed all over the world. I am sick of pink-livered politicians who place personal career above the fate of the flag.

I am sick of 40 years of relentless, creeping, cancerous, communistic godlessness that never once has wavered from its avowed purpose of conquering that flag and seeing it trampled in the mud under Russian boots. I am sick of my genteel desire to stand pat and pray while the enemy advances.

I am sick of educators who teach tolerance of subversion and of clergymen who would have me quail at the specter of battle and turn my cheek in fear of what our enemies might do.

In all honesty, the thing of which I am most sick is the man who let these things come to me—myself.

And by the living God who made me, sir, I am a sick American who intends to get well.

Are there any "sick" Carolinians?

Thoughts on Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as each new Labor Day comes and goes on annual schedule, our thoughts naturally turn to comparing working conditions today against the intolerable conditions that existed in long past years.

Gone are the sweat shops and child labor that existed before constructive legislation was enacted to correct these abusive evils and mercenary practices that befell the luckless laborer.

The real drive for recognition of the rights of labor started with the economic depression of 1873, and Peter McGuire, father to the inspiration that created Labor Day, was a forceful component of the small group that led the way to the many substantial gains made by organized labor during the ensuing years.

Much has been written and said about the gains made by organized labor, which gains are principally appreciated by members of the joined labor groups. Would it not be wonderful to know how many others outside the organized labor groups realize and appreciate just how much these hard-earned gains have benefited their respective positions in

A7068

life? We should all be grateful for the dedicated life struggle of Peter McGuire in his pioneer efforts to bring into reality the favorable labor conditions as they exist today.

James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL-CIO, has eloquently revived and focused our attention on the meritorious efforts of this great man in his speech at the graveside of Peter McGuire in Camden, N.J., on Labor Day, September 3. I know that Peter McGuire everlastingly sleeps in the knowledge that his efforts were not in vain and that his name will be forever perpetuated in the annals of organized labor.

He may also rest better in the knowledge that the world of the laboring man today is in far better shape than when he entered and departed this earth, and that many of his dreams have become a reality.

May I now, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, include Mr. James B. Carey's 1962 Labor Day speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY JAMES B. CAREY, VICE PRESIDENT AFL-CIO; PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO & MACHINE WORKERS, AFL-CIO, AT ANNUAL LABOR DAY CEREMONY AT GRAVE OF PETER MCGUIRE, CAMDEN, N.J., SEPTEMBER 3, 1962

Four score years ago this week Peter J. McGuire's dream came true. Down New York City's fashionable Fifth Avenue, on a bright September morning in 1882, marched more than 30,000 men and women who proudly called themselves cigarmakers, railroad men, printers, blacksmiths, bricklayers, dressmakers, and ironworkers.

But they also called themselves, with even greater pride, something else—unionists—and they sang union songs as they marched down the avenue and into Union Square carrying signs and placards that read: "Labor Will Be United," and "Eight Hours for Work, Eight Hours for Rest, Eight Hours for What We Will."

Peter McGuire's dream, the Nation's first Labor Day, had been proposed by this Camden labor leader, the general secretary of the Carpenters Union, at a meeting of the New York City Central Labor Union 4 months earlier.

Today, 80 years later, we honor Peter McGuire not alone for the inspiration that created Labor Day; we honor him also as one of the truly great leaders in the long and bright history of the American labor movement.

Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, now a Justice-designate of the U.S. Supreme Court, has given me a brief message to present at this Labor Day ceremony. This is his message:

"Peter McGuire, perhaps as much as any man, turned the key that freed the American worker from a life of oppression and hardship. By his untiring activity on behalf of the working men and women he certainly helped them to be free.

"I wonder, though, what Peter McGuire would have to say if he could visit us today, nearly a half-century after his death.

"He would find more people at work in America than lived here when he was alive. He would find them enjoying the highest standard of living the world has ever known. And he would see every sign that the men who run his country's affairs are determined that the future will be safe, peaceful, and prosperous.

"I think Peter McGuire would be proud to be an American in 1962."

We all, I am sure, will agree with Secretary Goldberg. Yes, Peter McGuire would most certainly be proud to be an American in 1962.

I am equally sure that Peter McGuire would be proud in 1962 to be a member of the American labor movement.

He would be proud of its size, because size connotes strength; and Peter McGuire was ahead of his time in believing in the complete organization of all workers. He said, "The interests of the working classes are everywhere identical and we should do all in our power to organize all trades and callings in every city, town, and hamlet in the country."

Peter McGuire would be proud of our labor movement's democracy, because he insisted on internal democracy in the union he founded; the carpenters, and in the American Federation of Labor which he helped to organize in 1886, just 4 years after the first Labor Day.

Peter McGuire would be proud of our labor movement's militancy, because McGuire himself was not only a brilliant and aggressive strike leader; he was a two-fisted fighter for the cause of justice whenever he encountered injustice. The depression that started in 1873 was the most terrible that had ever struck the United States; the unemployed literally starved in Philadelphia and New York. McGuire headed a group of union leaders which met with the New York City Board of Aldermen to demand unemployment relief. There was a heated discussion. McGuire first begged and pleaded with the aldermen. When begging and pleading failed, he threatened (according to a historian) "to throw them out of the window one by one if unemployment relief was not granted."

Peter McGuire would be proud of our labor movement's political action, because far more than any other major labor leader of his time McGuire believed in political action by organized labor. In fact, he spent most of his time from 1876 to 1878 persuading unions to take up political action, and he himself campaigned tirelessly in State and local elections on behalf of the workingman's party.

Peter McGuire would be proud of our labor movement's economic gains, because he himself was probably the most sensational organizer and bargainer of his time. In a single year in St. Louis, McGuire not only organized four large local unions but was able to increase carpenter's wages by 100 percent.

Peter McGuire would be proud of our labor movement's internationalism, because he himself believed devoutly in the internationalism of labor and the brotherhood of workmen of all countries. Only 2 months after he had founded the Carpenter's Union, McGuire traveled to Europe to participate in an International Socialist Congress.

There is no more appropriate place than here at his grave, 110 years after his birth and 80 years after the first Labor Day, to suggest that Peter McGuire has suffered at the hands of history. The evidence accumulates that he was a more impressive and effective leader of men, a more inspired pioneer of unionism, and a greater genius of organizing, negotiating and strike action than history has generally acknowledged.

Two things, perhaps, have served to dim the picture of his genius and the towering stature of his talents and accomplishments. First, he has become known to millions solely in his role as "father of Labor Day." Second, in his lifetime and afterward he was overshadowed by his close friend and associate Samuel Gompers.

It does not detract from this historic importance of Gompers to note that some historians contend that McGuire was Gompers equal but that the major capabilities of the

two men were in different areas of trade union leadership. Thus, Labor Historian Herbert Harris, writing of the AFL's early attitudes and policies, tells us, "In the main they were the ideas of a brilliant Irishman, P. J. McGuire, secretary of the new federation. But he was the braintruster rather than the administrative personality, and the executive direction of the federation fell into the hands of a London-born, Dutch-Jewish cigarmaker named Samuel Gompers."

We know that Gompers himself was one of Peter McGuire's warmest admirers from the time the two met while still in their early teens. Gompers, in his autobiography, recalls how he drifted into the debating club room at Cooper Union, where he and McGuire attended the free classes and lectures. Says Gompers: "I came in contact with young men, many of whom were striving to learn. One of these was Peter J. McGuire, then an alert attractive young Irish-American hungry for information and opportunities to discuss current problems."

Later Gompers described him as "a fiery young orator with a big heart." In the 1880's during the nationwide campaign for the 8-hour day, Gompers wrote, "P. J. McGuire spoke almost continuously. He threw himself into the work with all the enthusiasm and ability that distinguished his leadership."

In this period the newly formed AFL had a major problem with its affiliates, a problem that could have proved fatal to the infant AFL. Many of its affiliates wouldn't stay affiliated. They would join and depart from the federation almost on whimsy, on the merest of excuses, in again, out again.

"Sometimes," wrote Gompers, "I was fighting singlehanded to hold the federated organization together. The only other officer of the federation who felt a real responsibility for the work was P. J. McGuire. The mainstay of his own struggling organization, he found time for the problems and the work of the federation."

If it were for no other reason than this Peter McGuire should go down in American labor history as a major figure; because in Gompers' words, only he and McGuire understood the importance of keeping the AFL effectively federated, only he and McGuire struggled against the periodic fragmentation of the American Federation of Labor.

But for McGuire it must also be said, there were heartaches in this dedication to the labor movement. During the Christmas period of 1873 the unemployment situation became worse. Peter McGuire was probably the outstanding leader, Gompers related, as "the unemployed filled the city's streets and squares and marched to conferences with aldermen and mayor at the city hall."

The press worked itself almost into an insane rage over McGuire. "Then began efforts to thwart the movement by trickery. P. J. McGuire's father was employed in one of the large departments stores. He was an honest hard-working man, accustomed to yield obedience to authority. He was made to feel that Peter was disgracing him by idleness, consorting with unemployed 'bums' and freethinkers. One Sunday morning he stood on the steps of the Catholic Church and denounced and disowned his son. The city hall politicians tried to use the incident to break McGuire's spirit. He was tender-hearted and the treatment hurt, but he stood by the cause."

Certain it is that only Samuel Gompers played a greater, a more historically crucial role in the origins and early development of the AFL than did Peter McGuire.

In November 1882, 2 months after the first Labor Day but 4 years before the founding of the American Federation of Labor, Peter McGuire, in an appeal to the federation of trades and labor unions, called in effect for the creation of the AFL.